THE ARYAN PATH

Point out the "Way"—however dimly, and lost among the host—as does the evening star to those who tread their path in darkness.

—The Voice of the Silence

Vol. XIV AUGUST 1943 No. 8

SOCIALISM — WHAT KIND?

Once make the feelings of confidence and affection universal, and the distinctions of property and power will vanish.—SHELLEY.

Those who are at present engaged n preparing blueprints for a new orld order admit, though sometimes rudgingly, that socialism in one orm or another will enter into the olitical make-up of the future.

The discussion of the subject of ocialism has received a new impetus ecause of the step taken by the ocialist nation *par excellence*, Russia, which we made reference in our st number.

The idea which naturally presses pon so many minds is of importnce: If in the name of democracy stems of government arose which ade for the failure of democracy, it not possible for a type of cialism to arise in the world which ould make for the failure of real cialism?

What is of moment, therefore, is t whether socialism is going to evail but whether socialism of the ght kind is going to prevail. When we say the right kind of socialism, we have in mind not merely the political and economic aspects—these are aspects which loom too large in popular imagination to make a proper understanding of socialism possible—but a wider concept, more comprehensive and more dynamic. Socialism has been so frequently associated with the problem of providing equality of economic opportunities that its true moral and spiritual implications have hardly been heeded. We always think of economic inequality, social injustice and proletarian squalor and of the problem of removing these by a system of political and economic planning which we facilely term Socialism. In fact, socialism has become almost synonymous with a political philosophy which seeks to level down all economic and social barriers and to push the proletariat to positions of political power. No

doubt the growing intensity of capitalistic exploitation has greatly accentuated this trend of thought. The capital-owning class has set a poor example by sensuous living and by enhancing the value of material comforts and reducing that of spiritual, idealistic and cultural pursuits (we say this not overlooking the benefits conferred by the Carnegie, Rockefeller, Nuffield and other Foundations); this has encouraged the tacit assumption that if once the economic ills are remedied, all will be well. That is the basic error which accredited socialists as well as others fall into; they forget that man does not live by bread alone!

True socialism is essentially an ideal of sociality, and it involves a conception of life lived with and among other men; that this living with other men in understanding co-operation is a basic and fundamental part of the concept, not even those who would emphasise the economic aspect only will deny. That it is not a system but a way of life in relation to others is admitted by no less a socialist than Mr. G. D. H. Cole himself. The very word suggests the principle of sociality, of association, of fellowship and fraternity. True socialism has its roots, therefore, not in any system imposed from without but in the hearts of men. For its effective working it has to depend not upon the external, the coercive machinery of law but upon the spontaneous willingness of every individual to look upon every other as he would look upon himself —as first and foremost a *human* being. That is real equality—to be inspired by a consciousness of human unity and to be aware that there is no injustice save what man himself would create through selfishness. Such a sense of individual responsibility and the feeling that what help we can give others is but help given to our own brothers and sisters can draw together mankind into a real unity and thus dissipate all ills, including the economic. True socialism is more a spiritual ideal than an economic creed and draws its sustenance from the innate human tendency to fraternise.

The erroneous belief has persisted long, and still persists to a considerable extent, that socialism and democracy are concepts imported into India from the West. One has but to turn back, not only to the philosophic concepts of the *Shrutis* and the *Smritis*, but also to the actual working in practice of the Village Panchayats, to see how people managed their affairs without pretentious labels for forms of government. One has only to open one's ears to the teachings of the *Upanishads* and the *Gita*, which realised the spiritual basis of all humanity—the basis that always makes for true socialism and true democracy. Nobody has taught this more clearly than India's saintly, much misunderstood and much maligned leader, Gandhiji. In *Harijan* of 2nd January 1937 he wrote (We are indebted for these quotations to *The Gandhi Sutras* by

D. S. Sarma) :—

Real socialism has been handed down to us by our ancestors who taught, "All land belongs to Gopal, where then is the boundary line ? Man is the maker of that line and he can therefore unmake it." Gopal literally means shepherd; it also means God. In modern language it means the State i. e., the people. That the land today does not belong to the people is too true. But the fault is not in the teaching. It is in us who have not lived up to it.

I have no doubt that we can make as good an approach to it as is possible for any nation, not excluding Russia, and that without violence. The most effective substitute for violent dispossession is the wheel with all its implications. Land and all property is his who will work it. Unfortunately the workers are or have been kept ignorant of this simple fact.

Turn next to Gandhiji's commentary in *Harijan* of 30th January 1937 on the great verse of the *Ishopanishad*—"All this—whatever there is in this universe—is pervaded by Deity. Renounce it and enjoy. Do not covet the wealth of another." He comments :—

This mantra tells me that I cannot hold as mine anything that belongs to God, and if my life and that of all who believe in this mantra has to be a life of perfect dedication, it follows that it will have to be a life of continual service of our fellow creatures.

Put this side by side with what Gandhiji stated in *Young India* of 6th October 1927 :—

The art of amassing riches becomes a degrading and despicable art if it is not accompanied by the nobler art of how to spend wealth usefully.

Generally speaking, it is the experience of the world that possession of gold is inconsistent with the possession of virtue; but though such is the unfortunate experience in the world, it is by no means an inexorable law. We have the celebrated instance of Janaka, who, although he was rolling in riches and had a limitless power, being a great prince, was still one of the purest men of his age. And even in our own age I can cite from my own personal experience and tell you that I have the good fortune of knowing several moneyed men who do not find it impossible to lead a straight and pure life.

The West has blundered into the present disaster because of its failure to recognise this spiritual basis of humanity and as a result it is toying with ideologies, in essence materialistic and unphilosophical. The concept of socialism today betrays a superficial concern for the inessential, neglecting the true basis and the spirit which teachers like Krishna and Buddha, and emperors like Asoka, taught and exemplified. Socialism is but a new-fangled and unfortunately much-abused name for what informs the entire heritage of Indian philosophical thought. The mode of life which India—true to her past—can name as socialistic is one which gives more than it receives; which loves and knows no hate; which seeks peace and enlightenment for *all* rather than for the privileged few; which aspires not towards political power for the masses but aspires towards drawing together the whole of humanity in ties of brotherliness. It does not attempt to pull down those on the upper rungs of the social ladder but strives to raise the lowly and the down-trodden. Is not that a nobler socialism ?

UNTOUCHABILITY

THROUGH SANSKRIT EYES

[**Dr. B. Bhattacharyya** of Baroda maintains in this article that when untouchables raise themselves to a high position of honour and respectability their social disabilities will rapidly vanish. This does not excuse the harsh treatment that they have received from orthodox caste Hindus. Has not, in fact, the very position accorded them by their fellow-religionists put grave difficulties in the way of their rising? And the Untouchables are not, as Dr. Bhattacharyya brings out, the only ones who need to purify themselves.—ED.]

The problem of untouchability has become quite grave in recent years. It is engaging the attention of the public not only in India, but also in Europe and America. The bitter controversy the problem has raised certainly merits impartial discussion in order that it may be studied in proper perspective. The subject belongs to the sphere of Indian culture and it is necessary therefore to trace the origin, history and development of untouchability through Sanskrit literature with relevant quotations. This is the object of the present paper.

Untouchability is recognised as a barrier that separates not less than fifty million Hindus from the rest of the Hindu population belonging to the upper classes. According to the prescription of the Sanskrit Śāstras caste Hindus cannot have any social intercourse with an untouchable.

The Śāstras enumerate sixteen kinds of Antyajas or untouchables whose names appear in the verses quoted below from Hemādri's *Prāyaś-citta-khaṇḍa* :—

रजकश्चर्मकारश्च नटो वरुड एव च ।
कैवर्तमेदभिल्लाश्च स्वर्णकारस्तु सौचिक ॥
तक्षकस्तिलयन्त्री च सूतश्चक्री तथा ध्वनी ।
नापितो लोहकारश्च त एते षोडशान्त्यजाः ॥
प्रायश्चित्तखण्ड, प. ९९८.

The washerman, the cobbler, the actor, the Varuda or the cane worker, the fisherman, the Medas, the Bhillas, the goldsmith, the tailor, the carpenter, the oil-presser, the charioteer, the potter, the bamboo worker, the barber and the ironsmith are the sixteen varieties of Antyajas.

Let us try to discover how this distinction originated, how it was nurtured during the long centuries and how it can be an instrument of torture to not less than fifty millions of Indians today.

Do the so-called untouchables form one caste? It does not appear so if we are to believe history. In olden days people were out-casted and ostracized for disobeying the rules of society. Those who violated rules of marriage and indulged in marriages of the *Pratiloma* type, were most certainly considered as untouchables along with their children. That was

a punishment for a flagrant violation of one of the most cherished social laws.

This is perfectly understandable. But among those who are considered untouchables we find names of several ethnic races, such as the Bhillas or Bhils, Medas or the Medes from whom Medapāṭa or Mewar derives. It is, therefore, not the violation of the rules of society or revolt against the rules of marriage or sin that is alone responsible for relegating a large section of people to the position of untouchables.

Amongst people considered as untouchables are men belonging to certain professions which were considered low in days of yore. Many of these professions are today eagerly followed by men of the highest society without any risk of being considered as untouchables. Therefore the distinction is not based on considerations only of caste, but also of racial culture and professions.

Then also among the untouchables are enumerated the Yavanas or foreigners and Mlecchas. The term Mleccha equally applies to Muhammadans, Europeans, Parsis and the like. It is very easy to understand why such highly cultured people should be considered as untouchables by the Hindus. The chief reason seems to be that they had a culture of their own, and it was not in harmony with that of the Hindus whose culture was for centuries dominated by the sacred scriptures and the Smṛtis. Below are given two quotations which enumerate the castes known as the Mlecchas and give their status in the Hindus' eyes :—

अथ म्लेच्छ जातयो निरूप्यन्ते....रजक-शौण्डिक-चर्मार-केरल-काण्डिक-वण्ठ-व्याघ-किरात-वैतस-वैण्य-पुक्कस-चाण्डाला-यवनाश्च म्लेच्छाः।

(The following belong to the Mleccha class :—the washerman, the wine-brewer, the palm-leaf worker, the Kerala or professional magician, the Kāṇḍika or the watchman of the village and the fields, the Vaṇṭha or the gardener, the huntsman, the Kirāta or the habitual thief living in jungles, the cane-worker, the bamboo-worker, the shoemaker, the Cāṇḍāla and the Yavana.)

न नीचो यवनात् परः यत्संसर्गाद् ब्राह्मणादि-चाण्डालान्ताः सर्वजातीया भ्रंश्यन्ते।

कल्यापध्दर्मसर्वस्व, प. ४४८.

(There is none who can be lower than a Yavana ; in his contact all castes are polluted from the Brāhmaṇa to the lowest Cāṇḍāla.)

In the time of Buddha there were many professions which were not assigned to any particular caste, but were labouring under the same restrictions as those imposed on the untouchables. Thus it appears quite clear that in this all-embracing term of untouchability, the lowermost castes, casteless professions, a variety of alien cultures and professions and ethnic races were all intermixed from very ancient times. The followers of alien religions such as Buddhism, Jainism, etc. were also included amongst the untouchables and their touch made a bath of purification obligatory on caste-Hindus :—

बौद्धान् पाशुपतांश्चैव लोकायतिक नास्तिकान्
विकर्मस्थान् द्विजान् स्पृष्ट्वा सचैलो
जलमाविशेत् ॥

षट्त्रिंशन्मत, (प्रायश्चित्तमनोहरे) प. ३८.

(Take a purificatory bath with garments on when touched by the Buddhists, Pāśupatas, Lokāyatas and the atheists as also by Brahmins who indulge in heinous deeds.)

That being so, the next point is whether the distinction between the caste Hindus and the untouchables is to some extent flexible. If the distinction is absolutely rigid, then under no circumstances can caste Hindus have any intercourse with untouchables. The sacred texts, however, give abundant proof that this distinction was never meant to be rigid. Many more instances can be enumerated but the following are enough to show this tendency in the scriptures :—

आर्द्रमांसं घृतं तैलं स्नेहाश्च फलसंभवाः।
अन्त्यभाण्डस्थितास्त्वेते निष्क्रान्ताः
शुद्धिमाप्नुयुः ॥

अत्रिस्मृति.

(Raw meat, ghee, oil, and all oils derived from fruits in the vessels of the untouchables become pure as soon as these emerge from their vessels.)

देवयात्रा विवाहेषु यज्ञप्रकरणेषु च।
उत्सवेषु च सर्वेषु स्पृष्टास्पृष्टि र्न विद्यते ॥

अत्रिस्मृति.

(Neither on occasions of festivals in honour of a deity, nor in marriages, nor in sacrifices, nor in all other kinds of festivals, does any pollution take place by contact.)

कुण्डे मंचे शिलापृष्ठे नौकायां गजवृक्षयोः।
संग्रामे संक्रमे चैव स्पर्शदोषो न विद्यते॥

आचारपल्लव (कल्यापद्धर्मसर्वस्वे) प. ४९०.

(The sin of contact with untouchables does not arise in sacred ponds, on platforms, on hills, on boats, and on elephants and trees, in wars and in travels.)

तीर्थे विवाहे यात्रायां संग्रामे देशविप्लवे।
नगरे ग्रामदाहे च स्पृष्टास्पृष्टि र्न विद्यते॥

—Quoted from अत्रि in कल्यापद्धर्म, प.४४९.

(Neither in a sacred place, nor in marriages, nor in processions, nor in wars and in times of anarchy nor in a city nor when a fire breaks out in a village, does any pollution take place by contact.)

The question of untouchability invariably leads to an examination of the caste system, and this can best be made by studying the question historically, because the caste system, started by the Vedic Ṛṣis, passed through many vicissitudes in this unhappy land through centuries of foreign domination, and does not in modern days remain in the same pristine form as when it originated.

There were many sharp lines of demarcation between the different castes and they had their rights and privileges recognised by law. The distinction of caste could only be real when backed by political power ; for instance, when there were Brahmin kings as in the case of the Śuṅgas, or when there were powerful Brahmin ministers under kings of various castes, for example, Kauṭilya under the Śūdra king, Candragupta

Maurya. The different grades of rights and privileges assigned to different castes must be maintained by the law of the land. In olden days a Brahmin's body was considered more sacred than anybody else's, and therefore, even for such crimes as murder or waging war against the king he could not be executed; if the offence was very serious he could be banished, but because his property was sacred, the banished Brahmin was allowed to carry away every bit of his property.

But this distinction of caste and of rights and privileges of higher castes received a mighty blow in the reign of Aśoka when he introduced the *Daṇḍasamatā* or equality of punishment and *Vyavahārasamatā* or equality in the eye of the law in the third century B. C. The rise of Buddhism and Jainism had broken up the caste systems to a considerable degree in the fifth century, and by the reign of Aśoka the time was ripe for the promulgation of the law which made the distinction between castes and castes, professions and professions absolutely void, because Aśoka considered them to be superfluous. Moreover Aśoka, being a Buddhist, had no respect for the caste system and not the least compunction in breaking up the monstrous practice of special punishments and special treatment for certain castes. He thus made the law absolute but he did it so diplomatically that in his time nothing happened to show that his orders were resented, because he always showed the greatest consideration for the Brahmins and referred to them very respectfully in many of his rock and pillar edicts. He always mentioned their names before the Śramaṇas or Buddhist priests who were his greatest favourites.

Immediately on the disruption of the Maurya Empire in the second century B.C. the empire passed into the hands of the Śuṅga kings who were Brahmins and the reaction took a rather violent form. The special rights and privileges of the higher castes were restored, the sacrifices stopped by Aśoka were revived, and the Buddhists and their monks were persecuted.

But in the first century A.D. came in the foreign tribe of the Kuṣāṇas who were rapidly converted into Buddhism, and it is very probable that Kāṇiṣka, the first king of the Kuṣāṇas also restored the *Daṇḍasamatā* and *Vyavahārasamatā*. The Guptas then stepped in at the beginning of the fourth century, and as they had also very scant respect for the Hindu social structure, they patronized all religions alike. Then the Huṇas in the fifth century broke up the Gupta empire, and as they were foreigners, it is logical to suppose that they had also taken recourse to the *Daṇḍasamatā* and *Vyavahārasamatā*. The Gurjara Pratihāras, Valabhīs and others were remnants of the Hūṇas, and thus in Northern India *Daṇḍasamatā* and *Vyavahārasamatā* were well established. Then came in the Muhammadans in the thirteenth century and

the English in the eighteenth century and practised the *Daṇḍasamatā* and *Vyavahārasamatā*.

If there is equality of punishments and equality with reference to special rights and privileges how can the caste system survive? Today if a Brahmin commits murder, he will be sent to the gallows, his body will not be considered as sacred; in this respect he is the same as all others belonging to different castes or religions. In olden days, if a Śūdra ventured to abuse a Brahmin his tongue used to be cut out, but was it the privilege of Brahmins to abuse any Śūdra? We do not know. But today both will be liable for defamation. Under the present law, the sanctity of the tongue of a Śūdra or a Brahmin is the same. The old caste has long been exploded, and yet it is a wonder to see millions of caste Hindus trying to safeguard their ancient rights and privileges, and clamouring and agitating against the removal of untouchability.

History shows that the Hindus have been accustomed to adjust themselves to the new conditions consequent on the *Daṇḍasamatā* and *Vyavahārasamatā* first started by the Great King Aśoka. If they had not been so accustomed during the centuries before the Muhammadan conquest, it is certain that under the Muhammadans and then under the English no caste distinction among the Hindus in the eye of the law has ever existed.

If we carry the theory of *Daṇḍasamatā* and *Vyavahārasamatā* to its logical conclusion it means that in the eye of the law both Brahmins and the untouchables have the same status; in other words, the untouchable has the same rights and privileges in the eye of law as the highest Brahmin. To say that the caste system exists as practised before, to my mind appears one of the greatest anomalies of the present day.

The conclusion that no civic rights can be denied to untouchables by any civilized government is thus irresistible. They have the right of the road, of all public wells and reservoirs, of all government schools and institutions, of trains and steamers and of employment in the public services. All governments are also in duty bound to exert their moral influence on public institutions subsidized by Government, including the temples, to remove the distinction of untouchability. If the subsidized institutions do not follow the mandate of the king on the ground of pollution, let them by all means be declared private institutions, their claim to any subsidy being forfeited.

The claims of the untouchables to all varieties of civic rights have been recognised since long, but I should like to utter a word of warning as regards the movement for the removal of untouchability overstepping inherent human rights. Every human being has the inherent right of not being touched by anybody, and a forcible touch is tantamount to an assault. So also every human being is free to exercise

his personal likes and dislikes as regards his food and the persons with whom to take that food. Similarly, marrying sons and daughters in the same fold in which he is born, is also an inherent right of man. Those who are behind this great movement for the removal of untouchability should see that they do not create bitterness by trespassing into the sphere of personal and fundamental rights of man and by insisting on inter-dining and intermarriage.

Barriers to inter-dining and intermarriage can vanish only when public opinion is educated and by the influence of time. In order to remove this social barrier great efforts are also necessary on the part of the untouchables themselves. They have to educate themselves, they must be cultured, they must be men of influence, they must follow all hygienic methods, appear clean in body, as well as in mind and speech, and dedicate themselves to the highest duty—the service of humanity. If the untouchables are able to elevate themselves in the manner aforesaid, their social disabilities will rapidly vanish, as they have vanished in the case of Europeans, Parsis and Muhammadans. If a Brahmin is not invited to a big banquet today he considers it a great hardship. The untouchables also should bring themselves to such an eminent position that their company will be eagerly sought by Brahmins and others, and that the caste Hindus will consider it an honour to be invited by an untouchable.

So long, however, as the untouchables do not bring themselves up to a high position of honour and respectability, it is idle to expect that the social distinctions will vanish. Their position will be the same as that of the depraved tenth of England rolling in misery, poverty, disease and death, and always a menace to the country.

Quite a great deal is being said about temple entry by the untouchables. The sacred texts are unanimous in saying that if an untouchable enters the temple, the temple and the image of god contained therein are both polluted. But there are many texts to show that the images being external have no real existence. No caste Hindu need be told that the realization of the deity through mental processes is of primary importance in worship. Thus in the Hindu texts we find the expression :—

देवो भूत्वा देवं यजेत् ।

(He should worship the deity after conceiving himself as the deity); also

न काष्ठे विद्यते देवो न पाषाणे न मृण्मये ।
भावेषु विद्यते देवस्तस्माद्भावो हि कारणम् ॥
चाणक्यनीति, प. ३०

(Neither wood, nor stone nor mud is the dwelling-house of God. Nay, he abides in the mind. Hence is the mind the chief factor in the conception of God.)

Thus to a Brahmin there is practically no necessity for an idol or an image of god. If it is necessary for anybody it is for the uneducated, the uncultured, the unrefined; and

more than anybody else the untouchable has the greatest need for an idol.

If the image of god is touched by anybody who is not pure enough it is polluted. Even all Brahmins are not pure enough to touch the image. There are many texts to show that the touch of a Brahmin pollutes the idol, and there are elaborate processes to purify the image. In Paśupatinātha in Nepal no Brahmins except the Pujārīs of the temple are allowed to touch the idol. A Brahmin who does not perform Sandhyā or who does not follow strictly the practices enjoined, who does not bathe or change his garments, or who wears leather shoes and so forth, is not considered pure, and it is extremely difficult in these days to find a Brahmin who under these rules can be considered pure enough to touch the idol. There is, therefore, seldom any idol which has not been polluted by the touch of impure Brahmins.

But since, as has been shown, no one, neither the Brahmin nor the untouchable is pure enough, it is necessary to take precautions against the idol's being touched by anybody except those in charge of worship of the deity. A fence round the deity may be erected to prevent pollution of the idol by touch, and no restriction should be imposed, for merely having the Darśana of the idol, on any one, including the untouchable. I can quote a text here to show that the body of the higher caste men is not polluted by the touch of the meanest of untouchables who come to the temple to pay homage to the idol of Viṣṇu :—

विष्ण्वालयसमीपस्थान् विष्णुसेवार्थमागतान् ।
चण्डालपुक्कसान् वापि स्पृष्ट्वा न स्नान-
माचरेत् ॥

Quoted from आचारसार in कल्यापद्धर्म, प. ४४९.

(There is no necessity of taking a bath of purification if bodily contact takes place with a Caṇḍāla or a Cāmār when they are in the proximity of a Viṣṇu temple for the purpose of worshipping the deity.)

To the caste Hindus I can only say that the idea of pollution is a matter of faith, and every caste Hindu has a right to preserve his purity according to his personal notions. But this purity is to be kept up by his personal exertions; he cannot for a moment make an attempt to preserve it at the cost of others, because no Government will allow that. For the touch of an untouchable there are purificatory rites for the caste Hindus, but nothing is prescribed for the untouchable who touches the caste Hindu. The caste Hindu is cautioned to avoid the untouchable in the sacred scriptures. But nowhere is it said that the untouchable should be deprived of such and such privileges for the benefit of the caste Hindus. In the days of Manu it is indeed said that some untouchables should live outside the city gates, and they should wear certain marks to show that they are untouchables, and it cannot be for a moment denied that

the untouchables were not treated with kindness in the days of Kauṭilya or Manu and Yājñavalkya. It was not so with all untouchables, such as foreigners or Mlecchas, but their law applied to certain castes such as the Caṇḍālas and men following some of the professions which were considered very low in those days. Moreover, the casteless professions were also looked upon with suspicion, and there were many restrictions regarding their residence and movements.

This precaution was taken with a view to preserving society, in the same way as we deal with the criminal tribes of today. Those conditions are no longer existent, nor are the Dharmaśāstras prescribing the penalties now followed. In modern days, however, there is no room for differential treatment and no one can be allowed to maintain his personal purity at the cost of the untouchables by depriving them of their legitimate rights in the eye of the law.

It is worthy of note in this connection how Bengal solved its great problem of untouchability under the daring reformer Caitanya. When Buddhism was destroyed by the Muhammadans in the thirteenth century and all monks and priests were massacred in the monasteries, the position of lay Buddhists became extremely precarious. Quite a large number became converts to Muhammadanism because there could be no intercourse with the Hindus, to whom Buddhists were untouchables. Caitanya made a daring attempt in the sixteenth century and incorporated all these Buddhist laymen into the Hindu fold, made them Vaisnavas and gave them a uniform and certain special privileges. The untouchable Buddhists thus all became touchables. Others who preferred to remain in the professions were assigned a slightly different status and were called the Anācaraṇīyas, that is to say, whose water should not be drunk by the caste Hindus. The Buddhist priests who were taken into the Hindu fold were called the Varṇa Vipras or the priests of the new professional castes.

Just at the present moment some of these Anācaraṇīya castes have become so refined, cultured and influential that it is a proud privilege to associate with them. Some of them have become so great that they employ Brahmins, behave as their superiors, advise them, guide them and many a Brahmin considers it a favour if he is invited to dinner by his untouchable master.

This happy state of things has been achieved not by legislation or Government pressure, but by the influence of time, and above all, by the great theory of caste competition started by the ancient Seers.

Finally, it must not be forgotten that the principle of untouchability was adopted in the past by the leaders of Hindu thought as a measure of self-preservation. And if that barrier had not been raised in the early days, Hinduism would

have been swept clean away under the successive waves of foreign domination. But today we lack those leaders. What will happen in the future none can say.

B. BHATTACHARYYA

THE PERSECUTED JEWS

Freda Kirchwey declares in *The Nation* (New York) for 13th March that if Hitler carries to completion his "cleansing" of occupied Europe of the Jews "no one living today will escape retribution for the crime." The article describes grimly, without histrionics, what is happening today. Seven or eight thousand Jews a week are being massacred. The vast ghetto of Warsaw is depopulated; every Jew is dead. In Cracow, where 60,000 Jews lived, 56,000 have been killed. If after the Evian Conference of 1938 the non-Axis nations had agreed to implement its resolutions this horror would not have been. A single strong country could have given a lead which the others would have followed. Asylum could have been assured to all the threatened Jews, Miss Kirchwey does not mince words:—

> If we had behaved like humane and generous people instead of complacent, cowardly ones, the two million Jews lying today in the earth of Poland and Hitler's other crowded graveyards would be alive and safe. And other millions yet to die would have found sanctuary. We had it in our power to rescue this doomed people and we did not lift a hand to do it—or perhaps it would be fairer to say that we lifted just one cautious hand, encased in a tight-fitting glove of quotas and visas and affidavits, and a thick layer of prejudice... Europe's remaining Jews will be saved only if their anguish has become unbearable to men and women who live in safety at a distance. They will be saved only if we recognize their fate as inextricably linked with our own.

It was left to the American Jewish Congress to call the great mass meeting in New York on the first of March, but important labour and liberal organisations also sponsored it. The executive committee of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees is to undertake a "preliminary exploration." But time presses. While investigators dawdle and States hesitate the persecuted Jews are perishing.

LITHUANIA: LAND OF THE GODS

[**E. J. Harrison,** author of *Lithuania Past and Present,* mentions affinities between the Lithuanian and Sanskrit languages and a possible common source of Lithuanian and Hindu tradition. Certainly there seem to be analogies between Hinduism and the ancient Lithuanian worship.—Ed.]

When that section of mankind which by contrast we dub civilized stands today aghast and horror-stricken at the hideous spectacle of wholesale Nazi massacres of Jews in Poland, it needs to be reminded that in the perpetration of these excesses the Germans are but reviving a technique of frightfulness of which their "Christian" ancestors were among the earliest protagonists during the thirteenth century. Macaulay's immortal school-boy could have told our present-day publicists that Hitler's policy of "thoroughness" in the establishment of his "New Order" in Europe was in those days anticipated by the notorious Teutonic Knights who, with the papal blessing and an avowed purpose no less lofty than Hitler's, in some fifty years virtually exterminated an entire people—the Old Prussians or Borussians, one of the pagan Aestian tribes then inhabiting the territories between the Niemen and the Vistula. The conquerors appropriated the name as well as the lands of their victims, so that their descendants, the present-day "Prussians," dwell in a region which originally belonged to a race wholly alien in blood and religious belief both to their ancestors and to themselves.

The Teutonic Order (*Orden der Ritter des Hospitals S. Marien des Deutschen zu Jerusalem*) extended its dominion over the Baltic regions inhabited by the kindred Latvians and Kurshians. The Lithuanians alone, of all these Aestian peoples, had achieved sufficient political and social cohesion to resist successfully the savage incursions of these robber knights, until in 1410 at Grünewald the most famous perhaps of all the Lithuanian Grand Dukes, Vytautas the Great, inflicted a crushing defeat upon those blood-stained harbingers of the Gospel of Love. The Lithuanians' reluctance to accept the blessings of Christianity from such sullied hands is not surprising. In the end their conversion to Roman Catholicism was brought about by gentler means in 1385 when, as the result of the Grand Duke Jogaila's marriage to the Polish Queen Hedwig, the so-called "personal union" with Poland was concluded and Lithuania adopted the religion of the Queen and her Polish subjects. But among few peoples of the world, large or small, has the link with the past been preserved to such an extent as among the Lithuanians. In this respect they exemplify the truth of Schopenhauer's aphorism,

A people which does not know its

past is living merely for the time being in the present of the existing generation, and only through knowledge of its history does a nation become truly self-conscious.

That is doubtless one reason why in Lithuania the acceptance of Christianity has failed more than elsewhere to obliterate the survivals of many a picturesque ancient pagan ritual. This intimate association with the past is further demonstrated in the Lithuanian language, which of all living European speech today is most closely akin to Sanskrit. As far back as the eighteenth century the attention of German philologists such as P. Ruhig, J. Vater, von Bohlen, W. Humboldt, and others, was drawn to the unusual antiquity of Lithuanian. Theodore Benfey says of it :—

The Lithuanian language, even in its present-day shape, has to a large extent preserved such an ancient character that for knowledge of the fundamental forms of the Indo-Germanic tongues it possesses an importance which is scarcely less than that of, *inter alia*, Sanskrit and Bactrian.

Again, J. Karlowicz thus characterizes the antiquity of Lithuanian:—

Its resonance and endings ever remind us of the ancient sounds of the Indians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Goths, Celts, and the ancient Slavs. Many of the Lithuanian sentences are almost indistinguishable from Sanskrit, and this makes an even more vivid impression when one hears a simple peasant using forms which today, on account of their antiquity, we are accustomed to regard as prehistoric, somehow timidly revered, because formerly they were whispered to the forefathers of our ancestors by the Great Mother of all Aryans.

In other words, what in the languages of other nations has crumbled away during the intervening centuries has survived in the speech of the Lithuanian people, amazing the philologist with its richness and variety. Thus August Schleicher, one of the most distinguished of German Lithuanian scholars, after reading the poems of the Lithuanian writer Duonelaitis, declared that he was "conscious therein of a tongue which in the perfection of its forms could vie with the works of the Greeks, Romans, and Indians." These features of Lithuanian carry with them a lesson not only for the philologist but also for the historian. The fact that during so many centuries of bitter struggle with external foes the Lithuanians have nevertheless succeeded in preserving almost intact until the present day the distinctiveness of their speech should surely be accepted as evidence of their tenacity and innate national vitality. Their geographical isolation cannot be an entirely satisfactory explanation of this phenomenon. The Lithuanians even in Prussia, encompassed by the hostile Germans, maintained the purity of their language. On the other hand, the Latvians under German influence appreciably modified their tongue, which lost many of its older forms and gradually became modernized.

Schleicher likens the relations between Lithuanian and Latvian to those between Latin and modern Italian. Foreign words which during the ages have crept into Lithuanian and at one time were estimated as high as 35 per cent. are for the most part easily removable Polonisms, Russianisms and Germanisms which were foisted upon the more ignorant masses together with an alien administration, courts, schools and church forcibly introduced from without. They failed to touch the spirit or the composition of the language, and modern Lithuanian literature has without great trouble been cleansed from these parasitic impurities.

The singularly sympathetic Lithuanian character, the Lithuanian love of nature in her many aspects and much incidental evidence of the people's pagan past are reflected in the Lithuanian folk-songs called "*dainos*." The name of this type of song in Lithuania is indeed legion. The German F. Tetzner has dubbed the Lithuanians "*das liederreichste Volk der Erde*" (the richest in songs of any people on earth), while A. Leskien and K. Brugmann were amazed to hear old peasants go through a repertoire of more than a hundred songs from memory. In scarcely any avocation could the Lithuanian dispense with song and rhythm—at work or play, when pasturing his flock, dancing, going to war, story-telling, mourning his dead kindred.

But the love lyric is the most prevalent of all. Professor Reza of Koenigsberg doubted whether there was in all Europe any other nation which had so copiously and variously extolled in song the love of the simple peasant. The same authority in his *Betrachtung über die litauische Volkslieder* calls special attention to the pleasing effect produced by the use of diminutives and to the purity of tone and almost total absence of grossness or allusions to the carnal manifestations of love characterizing these lyrics. Says C. Bartsch, a well-known collector of Lithuanian songs:—

> I personally have not come across a solitary Lithuanian *daina* in which were obtruded such obscenities as are encountered at every step in a book like *Des Knaben Wunderhorn* and other anthologies. A grave yearning, a tender melancholy leave their impress upon these *dainos*. The love expressed in them is not a degrading passion, but only a serious, an honourable and a natural sentiment which compels an unspoiled person to feel that in this mysterious propensity of the soul there is something lofty and divine.

There is a wealth of evidence revealing the interest in these folk-songs excited among German classical writers of the eighteenth century. Thus Lessing in 1759 described as a "rarity" several translations of these songs included in P. Ruhig's treatise on the Lithuanian language. In a letter he remarks that these songs

> can teach us that in every land poets are born, and that lively feelings are not the prerogative of only educated

persons. What naïve wit ! What charming simplicity !

And Herder in his *Stimmen der Völker in Liedern* included eight Lithuanian *dainos*, one of which so pleased Goethe that he introduced it in his *Singspiel* under the title of "*Die Fischerin.*" Forty years later, when Reza brought out his anthology, he spoke about it in most favourable terms as fulfilling one of his long-cherished wishes.

The true origin of the earliest of these innumerable songs has long been a subject of pleasing speculation among foreign and native investigators. In this context it is interesting to note that two young Englishmen, Mr. Adrian Paterson and Mr. Martain Lings, who spent some time before the war lecturing on English in the Kaunas University, both dissent from the more popular and conventional belief that the oldest of the Lithuanian songs are the work of the "common people." And in an introduction to his translation of a selection of these songs, Mr. Paterson surmises that many of them "are undoubtedly the product of an ancient and highly intellectual aristocracy." In his turn, Mr. Lings, in his foreword to the same volume, insists upon a symbolical rather than a literal interpretation of these lyrics. He suggests a common source of what he calls the Lithuanian and the Hindu "tradition." The Lithuanian tradition, he avers,

was almost certainly one of the most ancient of this *manvantara*, that is, of this cycle of four ages, being no doubt an offshoot, like the Celtic and Hindu traditions, of the great primordial tradition which is said to have come from the North Pole. Indeed, in the Vedic hymns of the Hindu tradition there is the clearest possible evidence, through frequent references to long days and nights and long dawns and sunsets, that its people lived in some region of the Arctic, and among these songs one in which the sun is described as being for a long time out of man's sight seems to suggest that the Lithuanian people also once lived in such a region. Incidentally, it will be remembered that of the living European languages Lithuanian is the closest to Sanskrit, and there is a remarkable illustration of this in the song in question, for the opening words, *Dievo dukryté* (God's daughter) would be, in Sanskrit, *Dēva-duktrī*.

One other distinctive characteristic of the Lithuanian *daina*, wherein it marks a departure from nearly all other traditions, is the representation of the sun as feminine and the moon as masculine. Although no translation can do justice to the grace of cadence and the delicacy of imagery of the original, the following song illustrative of this special symbolism may be quoted from Mr. Paterson's rendering :—

Moon took to be his bride
  Sun in the first spring-tide.
When Sun woke up at dawn
  Moon from her side had gone.
  Moon, as alone he roved,
Morn's star beheld and loved.
  Then Thunder, wroth, with His blade.
  cleft him in two and said :
  Why didst abandon Sun ?
  Why Morn's Star's minion
  by night didst rove alone ?

Reluctantly one must resist the temptation to wander farther afield in the realms of fancy and conjecture and instead turn to the final division of this wholly incomplete study of certain aspects of Lithuanian life and character at the dawn of history. The transition is really easy because this division is an account of the people's ancient cult which over and over again reveals itself through the medium of the *daina*. The chief characteristic of the old Lithuanian religious belief is a special veneration for nature and all her manifestations. Judging from a plenitude of historical evidence and archæological legacies, to the Lithuanians of that age all nature seemed full of a mysterious power mightier than man, which expressed its relations with human beings either favourably or inimically. Christian chroniclers were amazed that the "superstitious Lithuanian" should, instead of a god, revere the sun, the moon, the stars, the earth itself, wind, thunder, fire, forests, rivers, lakes, hills, plants, animals, even insects. In their apotheosis of natural phenomena it may be supposed that the Lithuanians instinctively conformed to the principles of human development which have been operative in the case of virtually all primitive peoples, *i. e.*, animism and anthropomorphism. But in the religion of the Lithuanians we see a more immediate and direct relationship with nature devoid of any clear anthropomorphic delineation. Regarding all nature as sacred the Lithuanian offered up prayers to her as she appeared to him, without imagining any other concurrent external creative forces. Most significant fact perhaps of all, the Lithuanians were pagans *but not idolaters*, for unlike the Greeks and Romans, the Lithuanians of that day possessed no graven images of gods.

Their cult may be described as the first distinctive pantheism of people who, feeling themselves to be weaklings in the power of the elements, sought their concrete indulgence but made no attempt to embody those elements in a mythological system. Lithuanian paganism was not singular in recognizing both beneficent and hostile or even malign forces and phenomena. Among the former were trees and forests with which ancient Lithuania was prolifically endowed. The tree most closely resembled man ; like him it was born, grew up, grew old and in the end withered and perished. Belief in the intimate participation of nature in the fate of mankind is found in the entire *Weltanschauung* of the ancient Lithuanians. Sun, moon, stars, thunder (Perkunas), etc. associate with one another after human fashion and are not insensible to human anxieties and perplexities.

Lithuanian attachment to trees went so far that the life and destiny of a man and some particular tree would, in the popular belief, be combined in a single vital essence. And when the man expired the tree would also wither and die as though the man's soul had passed into it.

Survivals of this belief are found in numerous folk-songs and proverbs. And among the inhabitants of Samogitia the rustling of the forest and the crackling of branches are regarded as signs of the existence of human souls. In the *dainos* the trees implore human beings not to injure them, not to break their branches, especially the upper ones, and not to fell them, because in the fallen tree the soul of the deceased will no longer possess a refuge. Mierzynski mentions a Latvian *daina* in which the felled pine sheds tears, but is consoled by the woodsman who promises that its timber shall not be burnt but used to build a house. And when the Christians began to cut down the sacred trees people marvelled that blood did not flow from them. As a rule apparently the soul would pass into a tree growing on the grave, and perhaps for that reason the ancient Lithuanians dreaded being left without earth burial. According to the evidence of Prætorius, for the ancient Prussians the most terrible and degrading death was by drowning.

It was also believed that the gods had their abode in trees, and Æneas Sylvius records that the Samogitians attacked the missionary Jeronimas Pragietis because he was about to cut down an old oak, and in this way destroy the "house of the god." The story is told of a Samogitian who, wishing to rid himself of certain gods or spirits injurious to his farm, stripped from the trees the bark under which they were supposed to shelter and by so doing left them without a "house." As a direct result of this cult it is not surprising that sacred groves should have abounded in ancient Lithuania. The forests were reputed to be the trysting-place for countless supernatural beings, spirits of the woods, lakes and rivers, sprites, witches, goblins, nymphs and fairies, "sons and daughters of the god" commemorated in the folk-song;

> Under the maple, the well-spring
> Where the god's sons
> come to dance in the moonlight
> with the god's daughters.

Thus the sacred forests in Lithuania became the most distinctive feature of the ancient cult. It was forbidden to fell them, to break tree branches, or generally to touch them. Even the Grand Duke Mindaugas did not dare damage so little as a twig of these sacred groves. Foreigners and Christians more especially were forbidden on pain of death to enter them, and the Lithuanians themselves would do so only for prayer and sacrifice. It is true that trees had perforce to be cut down to provide wood for building purposes, but before any tree was felled special prayers for the tree's forgiveness would be offered up.

Yet, as already indicated, this nature worship was not confined to trees; it extended to animals, birds and reptiles. Among the last-named, the snake ruled supreme. It is recorded in this context that the poorer folk used to engage special sorcerers who would introduce the snake into the household with a

special ritual ; usually in a corner or behind the stove a nest was arranged for the snake, and this too would be consecrated by the sorcerer. In this manner the snake would become the guardian-protector of the entire house. As Jonas Malecius tells us, at a certain season of the year the snake would be invited with a prescribed ceremonial to the table at meal-time and by carefully observing its behaviour the sorcerer would profess to foretell the household's future for the coming year.

The Lithuanian nature cult was closely associated with belief in the transmigration of souls into trees, animals and birds, and the native folklore is rich in examples of the transformation of human beings into animals or birds. As late as the thirteenth century the chronicler Kadlubek, speaking about the Jotvingians, mentions their belief that the souls of the dead passed into the newly born, those of the illustrious deceased into the illustrious, thus ever improving, whilst the souls of the less worthy were presumed to pass into animals and thus still further deteriorate. According to this belief, every beast, every bird was said at one time to have been a human being who for defiance of the will of the gods had been transformed into such a beast or bird in order to expiate his offence.

The deification of thunder and lightning fostered a wide-spread cult in Lithuania. The god of thunder and lightning was styled Perkunas and by virtue of his tremendous powers of destruction he was deemed most worthy of propitiation. At the other end of the scale, the sun, depicted as feminine, was regarded as the personification of the most amiable qualities. In the words of the *daina*, having risen she patrols the heavens and counts all the stars. The sun is therefore the symbol of love. The shepherds pray to the Sun-Mother ever to shine on them, to disperse the winds and the clouds ; "the dear little sun," "God's daughter," guards and befriends the orphans "on the seas and on the mountains," warns the drover, etc.

Lastly the cult of the sacred fire was one of the most revered and popular in ancient Lithuania. The patriarch Philothejus, in one of his letters (1370) describes the Lithuanians as "godless fire-worshippers." Fire was deemed the constant interceder between heaven and earth or the secret force of the language of the gods, manifested, as we have already noted, in lightning, and alike serving and chastising man. In the national sanctuary known as Romuva, the eternal sacred fire was tended by the vestal virgins styled "*vaidilutés.*" The Lithuanian writer Daukantas describes Romuva as a spacious hexagonal enclosure surrounding an enormous oak of great age. In the wall near the oak was an aperture, and in the rear were storehouses in which were kept the sacred vessels. On the right were the quarters of the Chief Priest and his subordinates. On the left of the aperture was an entrance for

travellers coming to worship the gods. Near the aperture was an altar on which animals were sacrificed and on which the eternal fire burned, fed day and night with oak fuel. This writer avers that in the trunk of the oak were three niches in which stood the three gods, Perkunas in the centre, Patrimpas to the left, and Pikulas to the right, all three being hidden behind richly embroidered curtains. Before the sanctuary skulls were erected on spears to show that none might approach on pain of death. Only the Chief Priest might enter here to answer the worshippers' questions in the name of Perkunas, and to this god, the writer declares, were also sacrificed prisoners of war. Should any stranger set foot on this sacred spot, his blood would be required to placate the angry gods. The same fate would overtake anybody venturing to cut down a tree in the sacred forest. Other authorities, however, dismiss the story of the images of the three gods as apocryphal and at variance with the consensus of evidence that the Lithuanians never embodied their gods in concrete form.

The cult of the sacred fire is closely associated with the name of the famous Grand Duke Keistutis, a fourteenth-century ruler of Western Lithuania, who, according to tradition, abducted the vestal virgin Biruté, one of the guardians of the sacred fire on a hill near Palanga, and afterwards made her his consort. To this day a shrine stands on the hill at Palanga to mark the spot where this romantic incident is supposed to have taken place. In those days every Lithuanian honoured the ashes of his hearth, his "sacred little fire" or "Gabija," goddess of the hearth and wealth. It was the concern and duty of every master and mistress of the household to preserve these ashes from extinction which would signify great domestic calamity. Not so long ago the Samogitian or Aukstaitian housewife, when raking out the ashes in the evening, would utter an invocation in approximately these words: "*Sventa Gabija! Gyvenk su mumis rami ir linksma!*" ("Saint or Holy Gabija! Dwell with us tranquilly and joyously!")

Little space is left to describe in any detail the sacerdotal caste of ancient Lithuania. P. Klimas, in his scholarly work, *Lietuviu Senobés Bruozai* (Outlines of Lithuanian Antiquity) does not consider that there was ever any central sanctuary for all Lithuania, despite the flights of fancy indulged in by individual chroniclers in an effort to invest Romuva with that character. M. Klimas scouts the idea that the word "Romuva" has any philological connexion with "Rome," and analyses it as composed of the stem or root "*roma*" or "*ruoma*," meaning a burning place generally, and the suffix "*va*" signifying in combination something possessing a burning place. K. Jaunius and K. Būga are of opinion that the word is akin to the Latvian "*rūme*" orig-

inating from the Indo-European root "*rēm*" (to burn), from which is derived the Lithuanian word "*rémuo*" and the ancient Indian word "*ramas,*" black, blackish, *i.e.*, being burnt. The common name for a sacrificator or priest was "*krivis*" and of the supreme priest "*kriviu-krivaitis.*"

E. J. HARRISON

BRITAIN'S COLONIES

Dr. Rita Hinden in *The Colonies and Us*, Pamphlet No. 4 issued by the Fabian Society Socialist Propaganda Committee, examines the colonial question in its twofold aspect—the problem of political status and that of colonial poverty. Colonial status has been that of "possession" and impoverishment the result of exploitation. Progressive realisation of self-government, the paramountcy of native interests and responsibility for colonial welfare have been the declared objectives of colonial policy. Practice, however, has always fallen short of principle. Since the trusteeship has been only nominal, grave abuses have resulted—in the allocation of lands, in the right to mineral reserves, in monopolistic control of economic life and in colour discrimination in the services and in regard to other civic rights. The Colonies express a growing sense of frustration and the demand for an increasing share in their government is becoming more and more persistent.

The author of the pamphlet correctly diagnoses the colonial ills. As basic causes she sees firstly an arrogant attitude of racial superiority, secondly, an unwillingness to forgo economic privilege and finally the absence of a purposeful policy. During the last two centuries, white peoples once dominated, have gradually, one group after another asserted themselves. Since today the colonial population consists virtually wholly of coloured races, the unwillingness to let go the hold cannot be understood in any other light. Economic imperialism of varying shades tacitly assumes—with ill-concealed concern for the possible economic loss to the Empire—that the Colonies cannot stand by themselves. The declared ideal of colonial policy makes their continued retention within the Empire difficult but economic interest makes their surrender to their own peoples unthinkable. That is how colonial policy in practice betrays a purposeless shifting from expedient to expedient.

Dr. Hinden's suggestions cannot but commend themselves to all right-thinking persons. She believes that "the colonial peoples must control their own destinies" by a federation of smaller units, with internal administration left to themselves, but wider questions reserved for collaborative decision. The question of status thus solved, the problem of poverty can also be solved. Rightly does the author stress that the success of such a scheme depends as much on the willingness of the privileged nations to contribute of their wealth as on the readiness of the less developed ones to collaborate.

The task is to develop a new sense of community and responsibility between nations, aiming—as we already aim in our home affairs—that all privilege shall in the end be abolished.

THREE DEGREES OF SOCIAL ORGANISATION

[**Nolini Kanta Gupta,** well-known Bengali essayist, is the author of *The Coming Race, Towards the Light* and *Yoga of Sri Aurobindo.* The West knows of Rights and Duties but transcending both, as he brings out here, is Dharma, "the law of self-nature." And knowing Dharma perfectly demands finding the inner and real Self.—ED.]

Declaration of Rights is a characteristic modern phenomenon. It is a message of liberty and freedom, no doubt—of secular liberty and freedom—things not very common in the old world; and yet, at the same time, it is a clarion that calls for and prepares strife and battle. If the conception of Right has sanctified the individual or a unit collectivity, it has also, *pari passu,* developed a fissiparous tendency in human organisation. Society based on or living by the principle of Rights becomes naturally and inevitably a competitive society. Where man is regarded as nothing more—and, of course, nothing less—than a bundle of rights, the human aggregation is bound to be an exact image of Darwinian Nature—red in tooth and claw.

But "Rights" is not the only term on which an ideal or even a decent society can be based. There is another term which can serve equally well, if not better. I am obviously referring to the conception of duty. It is an old-world conception; it is a conception particularly familiar to the East. The Indian term for a Right is also the term for Duty—*adhikara* means both. In Europe too, in more recent times, when after the frustration of the dream of the new world envisaged by the French Revolution, man was called upon again to rise and hope, it was Mazzini who brought forward the new or discarded principle as a *mantra* replacing the other more dangerous one. A hierarchy of duties was given by him as the pattern of a fulfilled ideal life. In India in our day the distinction between the two attitudes was very strongly insisted upon by the great Vivekananda.

Vivekananda said that if human society was to be remodelled, one must first of all learn not to think and act in terms of claims and rights but in terms of duties and obligations. Fulfil your duties conscientiously; the rights will take care of themselves; it is such an attitude that can give man the right poise, the right impetus, the right outlook in regard to collective living. If, instead of each one's demanding what he considers as his dues and consequently scrambling and battling for them, and most often not getting them or getting at a ruinous price—such as made Arjuna cry, "What

shall I do with all this kingdom if in regaining it I lose my kith and kin and all that are dear to me?"—if, indeed, instead of claiming one's rights, one were content to know one's duty and to do it as it should be done, then not only would there be peace and amity upon earth, but also each one, far from losing anything, would find miraculously all that he most needed—the necessary, the right rights and all that they involve.

It might be objected here, however, that actually in the history of humanity the conception of Duty has been no less pugnacious than that of Right. In certain ages and among certain peoples, for example, it was considered the imperative duty of the faithful to kill or convert by force or otherwise as many as possible belonging to other faiths: it was the mission of the good shepherd to burn the impious and the heretic. In recent times, it was a sense of high and solemn duty that perpetrated the brutalities that have been termed "purges," undertaken, it appears, to purify and preserve the integrity of a particular ideological, social or racial aggregate. But the real name of such a spirit is not *duty* but *fanaticism*. And there is a considerable difference between the two. Fanaticism may be defined as duty running away with itself; but what we are concerned with here is not the aberration of duty, but duty proper, self-poised.

One might claim also on behalf of the doctrine of Rights that the right kind of a Right brings no harm: it is, as already stated, another name for liberty, for the privilege of living, and it includes the obligation to let live. One can do what one likes provided one does not infringe the equal right of others to do the same. The measure of one's liberty is equal to the measure of others' liberty.

Here is the crux of the question. The dictum of utilitarian philosophers is a golden rule which is easy to formulate but not so easy to execute. For the line of demarcation between one's own rights and the equal rights of others is so undefinable and variable that a title suit is inevitable in each case. In asserting and establishing or even maintaining one's rights there is always the possibility—almost the certainty—of encroaching upon others' rights.

What is required therefore is not an external delimitation of frontiers between unit and unit, but an inner outlook and poise of character. And this can be cultivated and brought into action by learning to live by the sense of duty. Even the sense of duty, we have to admit, is not enough. For if it leads or is capable of leading into an aberration, we must have something else to check and control, some other higher and more potent principle. Indeed, the conceptions of both Duty and Right belong to the domain of mental ideas, although one is usually more aggressive and militant (*rajasic*) and the other tends to be more tolerant and considerate (*satwic*): neither can give an absolute cer-

tainty of poise, a clear guarantee of perfect harmony.

Indian wisdom has found this other, a fairer term—a *tertium quid*, the mystic factor sought for by so many philosophers on so many counts. That is the very well-known, the very familiar term—Dharma. What is Dharma then? How does it accomplish the miracle which to others seems to have proved an impossibility? Dharma is self-law, that is to say, the law of the Self; it is the rhythm and movement of our inner or inmost being, the spontaneous working out of our truth-conscious nature.

We may perhaps view the three terms Right, Duty and Dharma as degrees of an ascending consciousness. Consciousness at its origin and in its primitive formulation is dominated by the principle of inertia (*tamas*); in that state things have mostly an undifferentiated collective existence, they helplessly move about acted upon by forces outside themselves. Growth and evolution bring about differentiation, specialisation, organisation. And this means consciousness of oneself, of the distinct and separate existence of each and everyone, in other words, self-assertion, the claim, the right of each individual unit to be itself, to become itself first and foremost. It is a necessary development; for it signifies the growth of self-consciousness in the units out of a mass unconsciousness or semi-consciousness. It is the expression of *rajas*, the mode of dynamism, of strife and struggle; it is the corrective of *tamas*.

In the earliest and most primitive society men lived totally in a mass consciousness. Their life was a blind obedience—obedience to the chief, the patriarch or *pater familias*—obedience to the laws and customs of the collectivity to which one belonged. It was called duty, it was called even *dharma*, but evidently on a lower level, in an inferior formulation; in reality it was more of the nature of the mechanical functioning of an automaton than the exercise of conscious will and deliberate choice, which is the very soul of the conception of duty.

The conception of Right had to appear in order to bring out the principle of individuality, of personal freedom and fulfilment. For a true, healthy collectivity is the association and organisation of free and self-determinate units. The growth of independent individuality naturally means, at first, clash and rivalry and a violently competitive society is the result. It is only at this stage that the conception of duty can fruitfully come in to develop in man and his society the mode of *sattwa*, which is that of light and wisdom, of toleration and harmony. Then only do men seek to mould society on the principle of co-ordination and co-operation.

Still, the conception of duty cannot finally and definitively solve the problem. It cannot arrive at a perfect harmonisation of the conflicting claims of individual units; for duty, as I have already said, is

a child of mental idealism and, although the mind can exercise some kind of control over the life-forces, it cannot altogether eliminate the seeds of conflict that lie embedded in the very nature of life. It is for this reason that there is an element of constraint in duty: it is, as the poet says, the "stern daughter of the Voice of God." One has to compel oneself, one has to force oneself on to carry out one's duty—there is a feeling somehow of its being a bitter pill. The cult of duty means *rajas* controlled and coerced by *sattwa*, not the transcendence of *rajas*. This leads us to the high and supreme conception of Dharma, which is a transcendence of the *gunas*. Dharma is not an ideal, a standard or a rule that one has to obey; it is the law of self-nature that one inevitably follows; it is easy, spontaneous, delightful. The path of duty is heroic, the path of Dharma is of the gods, godly. (Cf. Virabhava and Divyabhava of the Tantras.)

The principle of Dharma then inculcates that each individual must, in order to act, find out the truth of his own being, his true soul and inmost consciousness: one must entirely and integrally merge oneself into that, be identified with it in such a manner that all acts and feelings and thoughts, in fact all movements—inner and outer—spontaneously and irrepressibly well out of that fount and origin. The individual souls being made of one truth-nature in its multiple modalities, when they live, move and have their being in its essential law and dynamism there cannot but be absolute harmony and perfect synthesis between all the units, even as the sun and moon and stars which, as the Veda says, each following its specific orbit according to its specific nature, never collide or halt (*na methate ne tasthatuh*) but weave out a faultless pattern of symphony.

The future society of man is envisaged as something of like nature. When the mortal being will have found his immortal soul and divine self, then each will be able to give full and free expression to his self-nature (*swabhava*); then indeed even the utmost sweep of dynamism in each and all (*swadharma*) will not cause clash or conflict: on the contrary, each will increase the other and there will be a global increment and fulfilment (*parasparam bhavayantah*). The division and conflict, the stress and strain that belong to the very nature of the inferior level of being and consciousness will then have been transcended. It is only then that a diviner humanity can be born to replace all the other moulds and types that never lead to anything final and absolutely satisfactory.

NOLINI KANTA GUPTA

RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE

[**Shri Shantichand K. Jhaveri** is convinced of the great possibilities for unity that lie in sympathetic and reverent approach to others' scriptures. But he does well to emphasise that no religion in the world today holds full or even unadulterated truth. One step towards unity is to accept the true and to eschew the false in every faith, including the one to which one is born.—ED.]

Mankind has formed certain rules of behaviour and morality for its upliftment, having at the same time regard to place and time for their application. There have been and will be changes in these rules. Generally speaking, man is always in search of peace. The means to attain that perfect peace for which man is striving is religion. Naturally there may be variations in that instrument with time and place. The great men of the world present the path for people to attain perfect peace and those who are watchful enough catch the vision.

But this type of watchfulness is not everlasting. Sooner or later other considerations enter in and consequently selfish followers give religion an existence separate from life. This separate religion fails to maintain connection, direct or indirect, with the ordinary acts of human beings and from that failure religion ceases to be religion and exists only as a sect or a creed. Force of character begins to degenerate and increasing emphasis is laid on knowledge of the sacred shastras. Knowledge begins to take the place of character and the shastras to take the place of religion. Weakness in character may be overcome by the power of knowledge and from this springs, as a natural consequence, pride. The original idea of the founders of religions, namely, to establish universal peace through the peace of the soul, is forgotten and under the pretext of religion, a thousand controversies are created and much evil results. How can there be any religion in ill-will, controversy and hatred ?

At present the followers of one religion show profound distrust of the followers of another. Two reasons may account for this. One is that we do not study properly each other's principles and scriptures, and the second is that we never admit the possibility of imperfection and discrepancies in our own. " My faith only is the true one and every other faith is false " is a belief which carries with it false pride and narrow-mindedness. One has to find out the truth from anywhere and then, after verifying it by all the crucial tests, one must adhere to it at any cost.

The followers of every religion assume that it is the true path of godliness and that there is no place for error in it. Now, looking to the

facts, religion is not dropped from heaven; it is an institution founded by man in order to attain the goal of perfect truth, peace and tranquillity. The founder of a religion may be perfect in character, learning and experience and he may have given out the best spiritual creed; the fault lies with the followers, who have made a mess of the original teaching; hence the later controversies and quarrels.

Of course, there are good Gurus but they are as rare as gems and it is very difficult for an ordinary being to trace them out. When we test religions with logic and sense, two purposes will be served. We shall understand our own religion better, having regard to prevailing ideas, and at the same time we shall be more sympathetic towards other creeds. We shall not renounce our own religion but we shall gladly accept anything worthy of it from other creeds. Not only that, but if there is any flaw in our religion, then our belief in the omniscience of the founder or in the sacrosanctity of our religion will not stop us from correcting it; on the contrary we shall begin to understand these beliefs in their wider sense. After realising this, we shall show more respect towards the founder of any religion.

Now let us see what the shastras say in respect of tolerance. The sacred Jain shastras in a well-known verse express the feeling of fraternity and universal brotherhood. The following is the English translation of this Ardh Māgadhi verse:—

I beg the pardon of every being; every being! forgive me; I have friendship with all beings and have no animosity towards any.

Know that that is the true religion, which is accepted by the heart and which is always followed by learned and saintly men who are free from attachment and hatred.—*Manu* (2, 1)

Having known this definition, which man, after reading *Bible* and *Quran*, can boldly say that there is no truth in them or that they are full of falsehood? Islam shows in clearest terms honour and respect towards other creeds in the following words:—

Say; we believe in Allah and (in) that which has been revealed to us, and (in) that which was revealed to Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob and the tribes, and in that which was given to Moses and Jesus and (in) that which was given to prophets from their Lord, we do not make any distinction between any of them and to Him do we submit. (*Holy Quran*, 2. 136)

We may safely say that no religion makes any compromise on the principles of non-violence, truth, abstention from theft, abstention from dissipation in thought, word and deed, and non-possession; of course, this for truly religious people. Certain people say that Islam and Christianity approve of violence, but—

But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. (*St. Matthew*, 5. 39)

If you will stretch forth your hand towards me to slay me, I am not one to stretch forth my hand towards you to slay you, surely fear Allah, the Lord of the Worlds. (*Holy Quran*, 5. 38)

After having been so enlightened, who can say, injuring the truth, that Mahomed the Prophet or Jesus Christ were lacking in belief in non-violence and universal brotherhood as compared with Lord Mahavir or Lord Buddha? It remains a fact that no other religion has analysed non-violence so minutely as Jainism and Buddhism. All religions, moreover, differ in their extraordinary doctrines. But all are unanimous in accepting the wider meaning of non-violence.

Islamic followers condemn the idol-worship of the Hindus. But the Hindu shastras never say that the idol is the God and must be so regarded. An idol is merely an instrument to help the worshipper to remember the divine qualities of Godliness. It is the qualities that are worshipped and not the idol. It may be a means but it is not an end in itself. As is an idol, so is a Mosque; it is a place to remember God, nothing more. But if the mind is open and pure, godliness can be found anywhere. Christians would ask how universal brotherhood can be possible in a creed like Hinduism which approves of untouchability. But to believe that untouchability is a part of Hinduism is a great mistake. Mr. Verrier Elwin wrote in *Harijan* (24th September 1938):—

We have no more right to regard untouchability as characteristic of Hinduism than Hindus would have the right to regard belief in Hell, the Devil and everlasting damnation as characteristic of Christianity.

Like other beliefs about other religions this arises out of misunderstanding which would not arise if each read the other's scriptures with respect and love.

Our present educational system does not teach anything about religion. We can hardly boast of any spiritual knowledge from our Universities. Kaka Kalelkar has written in one of his articles that grammar is deduced from different types of sentences; a code of language is inferred from the grammars of different languages. In the same manner, he said, our students must get such training as to be able to find godliness and the path of truth in different religions and different modes of life. Lawyers, for example, ought to study and understand the principal religions, because they have to judge between what is right and what is wrong and have a great rôle to play in moulding the character of the whole of society.

The political advantages which will naturally emanate from this type of toleration will be insignificant before the spiritual and social peace resulting from logical and sensible toleration in religion.

SHANTICHAND K. JHAVERI

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

A LITTLE MORE THAN SAINT, AND LESS THAN SAGE *

What is the test of a biography? It is this: that the careful, slow, studious reader (almost an extinct species) shall, having got deep into the volume, suddenly grasp the main Fact concerning the subject. This biography of Bernard Shaw by Mr. Hesketh Pearson satisfies the test. We grasp the essential truth that Shaw is a saint. Of course one always understood what Æ meant by saying that he "was the last saint sent out from Ireland to save the world"; but after examining Pearson's detailed account, that statement becomes really substantial.

I would like to leave the matter there and pass on to other considerations, but I fear the reader will want to know what exactly is meant by this claim. A saint is a man who has charity; who has compassion; who is without rancour or malice; and who cannot be corrupted. It is so rare to find any one on earth who is strong enough in himself to have charity and compassion, who does not bear malice and whose integrity and honour cannot be undermined, that when we are permitted to see one we number him amongst the gods and name him saint. (Though the man himself would neither approve nor like such a description.) We cannot avoid this conclusion about Shaw when we pass in review his dealings with a multitude of men and women belonging to the most malicious of all types—social meliorists, literary people, actors and actresses, committee fiends and lovers. Human beings were to him natural phenomena which one should not wish to judge nor dream of feeling hurt by, any more than one feels inclined to judge a giraffe or feel insulted by an ass. He always understood human nature. This does not come out in his plays to any marked extent. It comes out in his letters and in his daily direct dealings with people. He knew how to handle them, he understood their psychological needs. Hence it was only on paper that he made enemies; when they met him they were soon at his feet. It never mattered how insulting any one was to him, he did not bear malice, he did not hold a grudge, he never lost his temper, he never said anything that hurt a man's *amour propre*—while no one that I ever heard of has so invariably sought opportunities to pay subtle compliments to his opponents and his friends. Hence it was always Shaw who was called in to be the reconciliator, the peacemaker between Fabians, councillors, vestrymen, playwrights, actors,—for whom, as Pearson points out, probably no man in history has put in more disinterested work. In their midst he stood out as a rock of integrity, loyalty and honour; as a man who could never be found doing an unfair or dishonest or mean or underhand thing.

* *Bernard Shaw: His Life and Personality.* By Hesketh Pearson. (William Collins, Sons and Co., Ltd., London. 21s.)

Is this piling it on, do you think? Not in the least. There are data to support it over and over again in every chapter of Pearson's book, though he is far too good a biographer to point out these things directly. It might seem that a man with such qualities would be unbearable. But Shaw, knowing that virtue starts where virtuousness leaves off, as true temperament starts were temperamentals leave off, as heroism starts where heroics leave off, as religion starts where piety leaves off, clowned and joked his way through the business in the wildest of high spirits so that his real character was scarcely discernible to the naked eye. And one further point to explain why Shaw has been one of the best loved men of his generation: it is because, in his relations with people, he never plays the great man, nor puts on airs, nor a grand manner, nor talks down, but speaks to each man as an equal.

His relations with women have been marked from first to last by *chivalry*. An exceedingly large number of women seem to have fallen violently in love with him, and they included the most attractive and celebrated women of the day. His own response was sometimes as passionate. And on all occasions he was the opposite to heartless. "He steered her through her infatuation," writes Pearson concerning one case, "as best he could, finally keeping her just off the rocks." A good summary. No doubt many suffered, since love always commands the just price. But he was never cruel. His relations with women forms one of the most illuminating parts of this skilfully wrought biography. Shaw's understanding of the human heart comes out in his letters (compare his letter to Mrs. Patrick Campbell on the death of her son in the last war with that of Barrie's on the same), better than in his plays; and he reserved for his letters (which for quality are the most remarkable in the history of English Letter Writing, and in quantity will form seven volumes) and not for his plays, the privilege of passionate phrasing—strange,

The above are a few of the chief impressions made by this most readable Life of Shaw (the only readable one, for even Shaw can be made dull). In reviewing it I have been asked to remember the readers of this particular journal with its Oriental angle. But after all, Shaw is a human being and that is the chief thing about this book; and as Indians are also inclined to be human beings, it is pleasant to think what pleasure it will give those who take it out of the library. And as human beings, it will do none of us, East or West, any harm to set ourselves as high a standard of morality as he puts before us in person. As a teacher in the profundities he has little to say. He is a thinker, certainly; but not thoughtful. He is religious certainly; but he does not address himself to the core of religion, often mistaking theology and even science for religion.

Not thoughtful. What I mean is that owing to his excessively busy life and quick wit he soon fell out of the habit of thinking twice before he spoke, and far too often makes platform remarks both verbal and written. To take a light example: Pearson once said to him, "All the greatest literature is simple enough for the nursery." To this remarkable statement Shaw did not quietly and thoughtfully work out the answer—"Do you think so? Let

us see now..." and then take a dozen great books which couldn't possibly come into Pearson's scheme. He rapped out—"In that case the alphabet is the greatest work in English Literature"—a repartee which floored Pearson but which had no particular meaning. Very typical. Or he will write—"Pressing people to learn things they do not want to know is as unwholesome and disastrous as feeding them on sawdust." Sounds all right. But is it sound—if we think again? No. He thinks furiously about evolution and how Samuel Butler said that Darwin had "banished Mind from the universe," arguing at colossal length about the survival of the fittest, never noticing that argument of this kind can go on for ever and that it doesn't matter in the least since the *arrival* of anything is enough to stagger sextillions of infidels. Goethe's acceptance of Awe before the pure phenomena disposes of these futile conflicts, and as Shaw insists upon remaining on the circumference of the matter we cannot get anything out of him as a philosopher. Pearson thinks he understood the religious mind best. This is not so. He has never understood the mystic stand-point. And as for his Dark Girl's search for God, she might just as well have stayed at home.

No need to try and get philosophy out of Shaw. He gave us quite enough for one man. We have his wonderful plays, his priceless prefaces, and as a memory to be treasured for all time the spirit with which he took life and will take death—a wild gaiety which in its trebly gifted envelope stands unexampled in the history of mankind. Mr. Hesketh Pearson—though he has failed to conduct his researches far enough back to be able to give us the date of Shaw's birth—has just in time, while Shaw was there to help, provided an account which will allow posterity to get him right.

JOHN STEWART COLLIS

MAX PLOWMAN*

These essays of Max Plowman do not, as might be expected, do justice to one side of his character. In reading them, those who never knew him personally may be led to believe that he was first of all an intellectualist. Even when he had a subject that stirred him deeply, he wrote with the restraint of one who was careful to avoid the appearance of sentimentalism. His statements are for the most part considered rather than passionate, appealing more to the mind than to the emotions. And yet the man himself, with his deep convictions, his powers of intuition and sympathy, was so very much greater than what I have called an "intellectualist." He loved books and music, but his first concern was with life and humanity. He discovered "life," Mr. J. Middleton Murry tells us in his Introduction, on the Somme in 1917.

> Quite suddenly he saw it, in all its pristine radiance, the simple and abounding gift of God. And with the absolute confidence of a man who has received the clear call from God he "walked out of the army"; stepped clean out of the mechanical and inhuman shambles into which war has been prostituted.

* *The Right to Live*. Essays by MAX PLOWMAN. (Andrew Dakers, Ltd., London. 7s. 6d.)

He was an infantry subaltern then, and he made his declaration of refusal to serve any longer in the Army, facing, he believed, the probability that he would be shot,—an act of superb moral courage, made, also, by his contemporary Siegfried Sassoon, and others whose names are unknown to any but their own people.

And if I had known no more of Max Plowman than this refusal of his to play any further part in war, that single record would have convinced me that there was something greater in him than the fine intelligence which he unquestionably had. For those who are ruled predominantly by the mind will find for themselves a justification that excuses them from making the great refusal. "So long as we are merely *self*-conscious, we are not properly alive," Plowman writes in his essay on "The Problem of War and Peace": "We need to lose our self-consciousness. And that is what happens, quite simply, whenever we love anything. Therefore, to love is to have primary knowledge of the religious attitude to life." And later in the same essay, he writes:—

> For Pacifism is not the expression of a sentimental and exaggerated regard for the human body, but the acknowledgment of a religious reverence for the human spirit. It is simply because I have an absolute reverence for the highest potentialities in man, and because I believe those potentialities are incipient in *every* man that I am a Pacifist.

In those passages we see the real Max Plowman, and he still further clarifies all that "religion" meant for him when he says that

> the clue to purposive living is to present ourselves with such awareness, such responsiveness to the contemporary movement of life that we can perceive the possibilities of transcendence, and by obedience to the insight thus acquired, initiate movement upon a higher plane.

He knew very well, too, that this profession could not be confined to the study, nor furthered by the exclusive method of solitary meditation. He was essentially a man who practised his beliefs, not by founding a "school" or setting himself up as a teacher, but in the everyday relations of his ordinary life. He was happy in finding another exponent of the same faith in Dick Sheppard, and in working with him in the Peace Pledge Union, but Plowman recognised, after Dick Sheppard's death, that admirable as the work of the P. P. U. was (and is) in many ways, the secretaryship of such an organisation, was not, for him, the most fruitful avenue for expression.

It will be evident from these excerpts from the Essays that Max Plowman was fundamentally a religious man, and that his attitude towards life was essentially spiritual, but he adhered to no recognised creed. Like so many other thoughtful seekers of his generation, he sought the ultimate truths that lie behind dogma, and the principal means of his search was not found in books, but in the practice of life, a search for which he was well fitted by his fine sincerity. He was honest with himself, with his friends and in his writing; and if his love of truth were the guiding spirit of the world today, all our social and political difficulties would solve themselves.

J. D. BERESFORD

THE STUDY OF DREAMS*

Dr. Samuel Lowy, a psycho-analyst who is a refugee from Prague working in England, has produced a book on the interpretation of dreams with an enthusiastic prefatorial recommendation from the pen of the late Dr. Wilhelm Stekel. It is an advanced work on the subject, more suitable for professional than for lay readers, but if intelligent members of the general public should read it to satisfy curiosity as to the present condition of dream-interpretation in psychological studies, they will not be disappointed. The author has in a high degree the capacity for clear and connected thinking which his subject demands; there is a careful (and partly critical) summary of Freud's work, which was the starting-point for clinical dream-diagnosis; other schools of interpretation are indicated briefly but fairly accurately; and, thanks to the generous collaboration of some English doctors and of Mr. Herbert Read in revision, the English of the book is smooth enough in reading.

The author has his own method of approach to the subject, and although his claims for it are made with modesty, it is an intelligent and useful contribution. Its merit is that it constitutes a sort of paradigm for the conjugation of dreams, as it were,—it gives us a summary or condensation of the most usual types of dream, from the clinical stand-point. The present reviewer found this treatment of the matter of special interest, for it reveals with a new clarity what he has always felt to be one of the difficulties—or dangers—of psycho-analytic work, which should be taken into account by those who have recourse to it, either as patients or as practitioners.

Dr. Lowy's thesis is difficult to indicate within the limitations of a review, without risk of doing it some injustice. What follows here must be taken lightly, as the best the present reviewer can do, in the space, to give an idea of Dr. Lowy's illuminating conception. First, he confirms the opinion of other experts as to the existence of different levels of dreaming. At the deepest level of sleep there is either no dream-work going on at all, or what there is is of such a character that it could in no case be translated into words, concepts or even images of any kind, although vital activities may probably be going on in a kind of consciousness which is to us unconsciousness. At a slightly higher level, a profound bio-psychic dream-work proceeds, which is only rarely brought into waking consciousness and still more rarely retained in memory: and at this level there is apparently a generalization of all the vital problems of the living person—internal organic problems, problems of adjustment to the outer world, problems of work, relation to others, ambitions, etc. These are dramatized in the imagery, often apparently so inconsequential and mysterious, of which we sometimes remember scenes or fragments as "dreams." At a still shallower level, quite near to the waking state, pains or sensations actually in the body, external sounds or other events (such as distant gun-fire or a

*Foundations of Dream Interpretation. By S. Lowy, M. D., with an Introduction by E. B. Strauss, M.D., F.R.C.P. (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., London. 16s. 6d.)

horn blowing) may break into the dream from the real world without awakening the dreamer, who weaves them into the dream-work as symbols, often as a symbol to represent some element in the problem with which his dreaming mind is occupied. Thus, from the level of deep sleep up to the lightest dreaming upon the very threshold of waking, there is a progressive clarification, a separating-out of the problematic elements in the dreamer's total apprehension of his interests; and, conversely, these elements coalesce as the dreamer sinks into deeper sleep, into generalizations of life forces that are beyond our comprehension.

This conception of the dream-work, which Dr. Lowy illustrates with numerous examples from dream analysis, is actually a compendium of most of the best theorising about dream that one has encountered. But its effect—at least upon this reviewer—is all the more disturbing; for it presents the task of reading and interpreting dreams in so difficult a light as to suggest that it may be impossible. For consider what it implies. No dream can be taken at its face value: nor even directly at its symbolic value. The little dramas we call dreams are concerned with different problems as the dreamer moves up and down with the tide of sleep, so to speak; at each different level the play is a different one, and either introduces fresh characters, properties or scenery, or else changes the meaning of the same ones. Even at one and the same level, the players or properties from another level are often present, partly engaged in their own underplot and partly joining in the main business. What a fearful complexity this indicates, and how incredibly difficult to disentangle the meaning of any fragment which can be remembered and—probably imperfectly—reported!

This is not, of course, to express doubt whether dreams mean anything. They certainly do, and Freud and his successors, as well as Adler, Jung and others have given us some general knowledge about their biological function and their relation to our waking life. The misgiving which one has is whether the knowledge is reliable in any specific instance, so that it would be safe to act upon it; and in this respect the tendency of Dr. Lowy's book is negative. For he not only demonstrates that the dream material is a web of almost infinite complexity, in which it is most difficult to decipher any pattern corresponding to reality. He says that the analyst cannot really try to do the work objectively, and writes:—

> It must, however, be said in all honesty: *dream interpretation is always a process of groping and feeling one's way, a subjective manner of treating the dream material.* (Dr. Lowy's italics)

The analyst, then, really appeals to his own subconscious to "give him a line" on that of the patient. This is not necessarily objectionable: the doctor is *ex hypothesi* trying to help the patient, and we know that in practice he is often successful: but from what Dr. Lowy says it seems that we are in the dark as to what really happens in a dream analysis. It looks rather as if the subconscious of the doctor is trying to lead the subconscious of the patient. If the doctor is much the healthier person of the two, the patient no doubt may benefit, but is there not a danger that both can become involved, if not submerged, in subconscious tendencies?

That this sometimes happens is strongly suggested by the great difficulty that many patients experience in breaking off the process of cure; which had adapted them to the doctor but not to conscious, independent self-orientation in the world.

Whether it is really curative or not —a point on which Freud himself expressed doubts—the analysis of a person's dreams is at least a powerful alterative. What happens, it is clear, is that the conscious values and the philosophy of the analyst influence the subconscious as well as the conscious mind of the person whose dreams he helps to interpret. Thus the pupils and patients of a great psychologist have a tendency to go on living in the light of their teacher's personality and ideas, somewhat in the manner of a religious sect. This is the case, to some extent, with the pupils and patients of Freud and of Adler, and more so with those of Jung, who is convinced that archetypes and other spiritual beings are manifested in dreams, and has taught his patients to understand their dream life in relation to ideas of religious origin. But, as Dr. Lowy writes:—

> Psychoanalysts not belonging to the closer circle of Jung, find only very rarely his archetypes in the dreams of their patients.

And on the rare occasions when they do, we may conjecture, it is because they have read Jung's books. The fact is that as soon as we presume to help another person by interpreting his dreams to him, or influencing him at all in his conscious relation to his dream life, we are assuming something of the rôle of priest or magician towards him, and the pattern we shall decipher in the maze of his dreams will be that of our religion or our occultism. Psychology can never be science in the purely secular and Western sense of the word. The dream-interpreter may do good to the extent that he provides, together with this magical operation, a good example for adaptation to life; otherwise the powerful "alterative" that he applies will work but temporary benefits or none at all.

There are many individualistic psycho-analysts whose attitude to their task is pragmatic, even hand-to-mouth, and is not grounded in any metaphysical conviction as to the nature of man and his position in nature: there is a demand for their work and it is useful —as are aspirins—but not ultimately of therapeutic value. The great psychologists are men with a metaphysical basis for their work, which is more enduring; and the only finally sound basis for psychotherapy, including dream interpretation, would be, as Jung and others are well aware, that of an universal religion. But the great religions, although they undoubtedly influence the life of sleep, do not do it by analysing dreams.

PHILIP MAIRET

SECRETS OF SPIRITUAL LIFE *

In these troubled times works on spiritual subjects like this little book bring relief to thinking souls. Dr. Mohan Singh has already made a name for himself among Orientalists by his works on Mysticism. In this book, however, he appears in quite a new light and rises to greater heights. The reviewer cannot claim to any advancement in spiritual *Sādhanā;* he has not had the good fortune of coming in contact with a *Sadguru;* he is only a humble seeker after Truth and a student of the *Upaniṣads* and of Hindu religion and philosophy.

This mine of erudite spiritual explanation is divided into two parts containing over 400 paragraphs, which the author styles *Sūtras.* Like a true *Avadhūta,* the author has simply presented the Sūtras as intuitively apprehended by him; there is no order or arrangement, and the language is so cryptic as to vie with the ancient Sanskrit *Sūtras* in the need of a commentary to expound the author's viewpoint.

The special features are Dr. Mohan Singh's approach; his interpretation of different myths and processes; his system of correspondences, which requires the meanings and equivalents of important Vedic names, processes and events to be discovered not only in Metaphysics, but also in Astronomy, Physics, Mathematics, Prosody, Grammar, Chemistry, Botany and Biology; his general reading of the historical process etc. These would require a full-sized monograph for clear-cut elucidation and I doubt my competence for such an undertaking. In the present review I shall content myself with drawing attention to certain salient features only.

The author rightly demands of his readers, in the old Upaniṣadic way, Samids (dry sticks) and a receptive mind, as also a fair acquaintance with Hindu mythology, religion, Yoga and Vedānta. The general public likes to be spoon-fed, and Dr. Mohan Singh has scarcely attempted that in this book. It was with great reluctance that he added an "Index," for, according to him, intuitive apprehension is total, existential and of the nature of pure higher Algebra and Geometry and of classical music. To a superficial reader the book would be difficult to follow, while the Western reader will find it obscure: the book requires meditation for clear understanding.

Spiritual life cannot be the subject of objective investigation, but it can be grasped by a mystic realization. Dr. Mohan Singh has succeeded in disclosing and elucidating the secrets of spiritual experience with the aid of modern secular sciences. The author's insight, intuition and courage are marvellous. The style is crisp, pointed and poetic, and the book contains a number of pithy, apt expressions that may well become proverbs. On the whole the book is interesting and illuminating. It is original in that the majority of the *Sūtras* have been inspired by Life, and only a few by books.

The author presents novel interpretations of well-known Vedic and Puranic

**Secrets of Spiritual Life.* Vol. I. By Dr. Mohan Singh. (S. Sher Singh, B/2 Kapurthala House, Lahore. Rs. 2/8)

myths and legends such as those of Purūravas and Urvaśī, Śiva and Śakti etc. These are viewed in their *adhyātmic* aspect and recur with innumerable variations in name, form, time, space, etc. There are also various interpretations of incarnation, Vedas, Purāṇas, Śākhās, the Caste System etc. The author rightly states that "a parable can be converted into a biography and a biography into a parable." Dr. Mohan Singh's remarks on history, tragedy, philosophy, truth, mysticism, etc. can stand comparison with Nicolas Berdyaev's *The Destiny of Man* and *The Meaning of History*.

The following sūtras about history are splendid and eloquently present Dr. Mohan Singh's view-point.

"Only when history becomes mythology does its full meaning reveal itself." "The philosopher deduces meaning from history; the mystic puts meaning into it." "Purāṇa is the Book or Epic of Time." Indeed, as one critic wrote to the author, the *Mahābhārata* is far truer than all the silly histories of academics; for it is the history of the soul, and the outer world is but the garment of the soul.

"Truths of Spiritual life are irrational." "The way of Spiritual life is spiced with the spice of adventures," "is an ever-present, ever-complete miracle," and "the secret lies in wanting a thing with a disciplined body and mind, in a determined way, with the most passionate wish, and a concentrated desire."

The constituent elements of spiritual life have been thoroughly analysed in a masterly way, and the author's new approach characterized by mystical subtleties and originality will be of invaluable aid to those struggling on the path.

The author's views about truth also merit close attention. Truth at the highest is a mystery; expositions of truth in simple, ordered language are relative. Limitations of space compel me only to refer to the admirable way in which the author has handled his specialised mysticism of time and numbers, as also Symbolism and the theory of Correspondences.

The book is Vedāntic in outlook and maintains an Upaniṣadic stand-point in the interpretation of many a topic. "Vedānta alone takes us to the highest goal of Freedom, Power, Truth, Ananda-Joy, Creative Sacrifice. Other systems of thought are stages on the journey, a preparation-course." Dr. Mohan Singh thus formulates his new system :—

> God is unity, the Super-Unity, as well as the Unity in Diversity; only the latter we can apprehend, only thus far we can go. . . . To know God is to know, feel, experience, re-create that correspondency, interdependence, etc. on all planes and in respect of all loyalties and relations.

Rightly does the author observe :—

> You cannot abolish war; you can and must face it as long as you are in the region of Dharma; pass beyond Dharma, on to the spiritual plane and practice Ahimsa.

I enjoyed the book immensely and derived much pleasure and profit from it. I fully endorse the opinion of my revered friend Professor Gode that the book is "a modern Upaniṣad," and commend it to all interested in Spiritual life, feeling confident that they will be benefited. The author has completed another book *Physics to Metaphysics* consisting of 108 Śṛtis, each with a suitable title, and clearer and more radiant in its light and music. It is to be hoped that the new book will soon see the light of day.

A. D. PUSALKER

CHRISTIANITY AND HUMANISM*

Does the future lie with Ingram or with Inge ? Which is prophetic of the age that is to come ? "The world belongs to the young," says Dr. Inge through one of the collocutors in his book of Dialogues, thus virtually conceding Mr. Ingram's case, for, he, not the ex-Dean of St. Paul's, is likely to claim the allegiance of the young who will be quite undeterred by Dr. Inge's expectation of the "nice mess" they will make of it.

Yet his book reveals once again the latter's alert and wide-ranging mind. His own "terminus near," he hands on to the Ingrams of this world the task of shaping tomorrow's thoughts. But with no up-flaming hope. It may be, he says, that we are facing another period when men will be without hope and without God in the world. Superstition though it was, the doctrine of human perfectibility had at least the effect of encouraging human effort. That belief has gone, and since there appears no sign of a revival of belief in a future life, what is there left to dynamise human behaviour ? Others may answer. Confessing that, despite his reputation for gloom, he has never prophesied "anything so bad as what has happened to the world," Dr. Inge is content to restate his unconquerable Platonism, firm in his conviction that faith in a spiritual world is the only spring of real happiness.

Contemptuous of all forms of Futurism, he is nevertheless more charitably contemptuous, and readier to state his opponent's case, than in his earlier writings. Socialism and Communism, and all new-world plans, he characterises as utopian visions since he looks for no human fulfilment along the temporal road. Progress is a mirage still. Every plan for the worthier ordering of human affairs he sees as a carry-over into the modern world of the yet more extravagant notions of the nineteenth century. They are but pictures of a "terminal state," perfectionist dreams which can never be fulfilled.

What Dr. Inge fails to appreciate is the religious enthusiasm which goes to the maturing of these plans, not as glittering promises of a paradise on earth but as the necessary means for the achieving of a fuller life for the many as well as the few. It is here that Mr. Ingram offers a corrective. His book is a passionate plea, painstakingly argued, for a reborn Christianity purged of sentimental pietism and ideational theology, a socialised Christianity rooted in communal experience. For him, Socialism is not merely a political cause—as such it can inspire only a few to ardent action ; it is a religious demand involving a widening of spiritual perspective.

Religion, he affirms, "concerns not the self in isolation, but the self dedicated to the needs of others." Hence religion has its social expression ; it teaches the art of living together. On the political side this implies acceptance of the principle of common ownership of the means of production,

* *Talks in a Free Country*. By WILLIAM RALPH INGE. (Putnam and Co., Ltd., London. 8*s*. 6*d*.)

Taken at the Flood. By KENNETH INGRAM. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London. 6*s*.)

and deliverance from the profit motive. But even this, he recognises, is no panacea for every ill: common ownership is " the next essential stage in an advance "; and to further this advance he anticipates a marriage (synthesis) between traditional Christianity and secular Humanism, as representing the thesis and antithesis of creative thought, the one supplementing the other. Because traditional religion is couched in outworn forms it fails to speak " the mental language of the contemporary world." Secular Humanism, however, confuses the essence of religion with its forms; concentrating upon changing the outward system, it ignores the need for converting the personal motive. This need religion supplies.

Humanism emphasises the scientific method and is thus a necessary element in any cultural advance. So much we admit, but a *secularised* Humanism is surely incompatible with a religious philosophy. Belief in a spiritual world is fundamental and without it " futurism " is but a play of ideas, the dream Dr. Inge believes it to be.

Mr. Ingram places too much reliance upon the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, who may or may not have spoken the words attributed to him in the Gospels. To base conclusions upon these sayings on the assumption that Jesus actually uttered them is an unnecessary hazard, especially with the Fourth Gospel. Incidentally, Dr. Inge notes that the Gospel of St. John is finding many readers in present-day India.

LESLIE BELTON

The Dhammapada. Text in Roman with English Translation. The Text in Nagari with English Translation. By V. DHAMMAJOTI. (Maha Bodhi Society, Sarnath, Benares. 8 annas each)

This excellent little volume which comprises a translation into English of *The Dhammapada*, or " a collection of verses from the Teachings of the Buddha, " is presented in two forms, one with the original Pali text in Roman script and one with it in Nagari. This experiment in the presentation of scripts is a most interesting one and one that should be studied by other writers and publishers who wish to get the widest possible audience for their publications.

The book is an anthology of verses contained in the " Tipitaka, " or sacred books of the Buddhists. It is said to be the most popular of the " Tipitaka " books and to be equally appreciated in the East and the West.

There is no doubt that the thoughtful reader will find much of beauty and inspiration in these lovely verses, which range over such a wide choice of subjects as Vigilance, the Mind, Flowers, Fools, The Wise, The Worthy, The Rod, Old Age, Happiness, Anger, Craving, and the Brahmin. They do of course represent the strict, traditional Buddhist view founded on the Hindu Philosophy of *karma* and transmigration. To that extent they may be limited in their appeal to the modern mind. But whatever one's metaphysics or theology one cannot but get help and inspiration from this bubbling pool of pure water. In these days of the re-study of the foundations of life in order to build a better world, the going back to works of permanent value like *The Dhammapada* cannot but help to put the heart and mind of the present-day world on the path to peace and progress.

BANNING RICHARDSON

Dostoevsky: A Study. By JANKO LAVRIN. (Methuen and Co., Ltd., London. *7s. 6d.*)

During the last twenty years a number of books on Dostoevsky have appeared in English, many of which are indispensable to the student of the great Russian writer. One of these is Mr. Janko Lavrin's *Dostoevsky and His Creation,* but as he tells us in a prefatory note to this book that to all intents and purposes it can be regarded as a new work, it is treated as such in this review. One thing is certain : this study holds high place in the list referred to above.

Naturally, none of these books on Dostoevsky comprises its subject. To do so, a critical work would need to be written by one greater—on his own level—than Dostoevsky. Which is improbable.

> The principle of fugue, of "symphonic" treatment is possible in a novel only if the author gives the most opposite themes and motives an equal chance. And this is what Dostoevsky does.

And this is what Mr. Lavrin does in his study of him. And it is precisely because he does this that his book has superlative value. Nearly all critical works on Dostoevsky are conditioned by the authors' mental or temperamental affinities, the result being that each presents only one aspect of his subject—often with sincerity, insight, conviction—in order to show that Dostoevsky was a Christian, a nihilist, an "underground" man, a "cruel" genius, and so on. These critics—like most of those concerned with Shakespeare—are genuinely convinced that their subject resembles themselves. Mr. Lavrin is not of them. He does not attempt to prove ; he seeks to illuminate —and the fact that he succeeds is a notable triumph, for his task is a formidable one.

It is formidable because of the number and the complexity of Dostoevsky's ideas and because the most contradictory thoughts, the most conflicting emotions, existed simultaneously in him. Never was such duality. Consequently, it is no coincidence that the theme of the "Double" is dominant in each of the major novels.

To attempt to label such a writer is to reveal oneself, not Dostoevsky.

Baudelaire announced the pathetic fact that man implores God and the devil simultaneously. But Dostoevsky *rebelled* "against God in the name of Satan, and against Satan in the name of God—simultaneously." That sentence, with its infinite implications, is the truth so far as the truth, on such a subject, can be narrowed to a single statement.

It follows that Dostoevsky is the "great psychologist of disintegration" —not in detachment, like Proust, but as "part and parcel of his own spiritual quest." Consequently, it is inevitable that

> the very form of a Dostoevskian novel results from the dynamic tension between several contradictory planes and trends of one and the same consciousness—each of them with its own conclusions.

Mr. Lavrin's fugal treatment of his subject is indicated by the Contents page, which shows his concern with Dostoevsky as man, artist, psychologist, "under-world" spirit, analyst of the superman—in addition to separate critical evaluations of the famous novels.

The two last chapters stress not only the relevance of all that precedes them to the inferno of today, but also indicate the unique possibilities, up and

down, which confront us who stand at "the most ominous cross-roads in history."

Above all, they analyse that universalism which, according to Dostoevsky, is the quintessence of the Russian national character—a universalism that will have influence of the first magnitude on the shape of things to come.

Mr. Lavrin has written a very remarkable book.

CLAUDE HOUGHTON

Dark Testament. By PETER ABRAHAMS. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

This is a book which nobody should keep. It is one to be passed on and on, for however many copies are printed it can never be read by enough people—especially people of the white races.

Peter Abrahams is a powerful and clever writer. In simple language he conveys messages which must be conveyed if the tragic lot of the Negro race in Africa is ever to be understood by white people. In little sketches and stories he brings to the reader the reality of Africa. The reality of racial inequality, the reality of the Negro's poverty, the reality of his humiliation are but the better demonstrated for being described in everyday happenings to everyday people.

Nobody could read this book and remain totally indifferent to the fate of the natives of Africa. Remember, it is written by a coloured man who has struggled from the depths himself to describe the sufferings of his fellow-men and women who still writhe there, in their misery. His very capacity as a writer is a reply to those who condemn the coloured races as inferior. None but a good brain could produce such writing, none but a big heart could so touch other hearts and none but a great mind could so rise above adversity to serve his brothers.

Striking is the author's sympathy for "brother Jew." That the coloured man should still find pity and sympathy for his persecuted white brother is a mark of greatness—for I still think the Negro's lot is the hardest. After all the colour bar is the last refinement of racial prejudice.

Mr. Abrahams does not hide the weaknesses of the Negro people. He shows how many of them accept their hard lot as the natural state of affairs —although he also points out the fearful part the Christian religion has played in the enslavement of native Africans. And the part played by Business.

If one could have desired any change in the book it would have been to have more of it. More descriptions of the injustices suffered by the Negroes, more everyday scenes of humiliation, more arrows pointing to the crimes of the white man. I hope Mr Abrahams will write more and that more and more people will read of the barbarities committed by white men who are neither Nazis nor Fascists, but people of the British Empire. *Dark Testament* is enthralling, heart-rending, heart-touching—and humiliating. May many a white man read it!

MILLER WATSON

India as Described in Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism. By BIMALA CHURN LAW. (Luzac and Co., London).

It is hard to find an epoch of history surpassing in interest and value the spacious ages into which the Buddha and Mahavira poured enrichment. A new authentic account of those fruitful ages is welcome, the more so when based on material derived from the early texts of the Buddhists and Jainas, written in Pali and Ardha-magadhi. Yet, to extract the right material out of them is a stupendous task. Dr. Bimala Churn Law, who has undertaken such a task a dozen times and won remarkable success in each instance, deserves the congratulations of all who have loved Ancient India and found joy, found inspiration, in its unique culture.

The five chapter heads indicate the scope of this volume : " Geography, " " Kings and Peoples, " " Social Life and Economic Conditions," " Religion " and " Education and Learning." There are also a bibliography, an index and a map of India setting forth the location of contemporary towns and kingdoms.

Each chapter, precise, richly documented, revealing the author's complete mastery over his material, is of interest. The last two in particular justify his claim of a new approach, a broadening of the pathway opened by Rhys Davids.

Religion in those days was not simply a source of inspiration for philosophy and ethics, but, Dr. Law tells us, " it was a living factor of ancient Indian civilisation. " And he goes on to postulate :—

> Brahmanism was the only form of higher religion in India which could affiliate all the popular cults without any feeling of contradiction. The religious beliefs and practices grew up among different tribes, races and nations and were cherished by them with veneration and joy....In spite of the apparent victory and predominance of the higher religions over the folk, the latter always held the ground....The folk religion afforded indeed the living ground of synthesis of contending faiths. And with the march of time when it became sufficiently strong and self-conscious, it asserted itself as a great religion of Bhakti influencing the whole domain of the higher faiths, Jain, Buddhist, and all.

The bibliography is somewhat inadequate. It is a list in alphabetical order without any classification. Could not the Buddhist, Jaina and Brahman sources be separately indicated, and secondary works (modern) be listed apart from original sources, in the alphabetical order of their respective authors ?

It is significant that the present work is a thesis approved for the D. Litt. Degree in the University of Lucknow. I have a feeling that Indian historians, while they rightly assess scholarship, tend to ignore the fact that history is also an art. They do not seem to believe in style, in readability. Yet the two factors can be so effectively combined. How scholarly and yet readable are the works of leading British and American historians ! Dr. Law fails in this respect. He ignores the graces of style. He presents not gold, but gold ore. It is hard to expect that many lay readers attracted by the great interest of the subject-matter will have patience enough to go through the entire volume. This, of course, is no reflection on the author. The intrinsic value of his research is quite unassailable.

BHABANI BHATTACHARYA

Communion in the Messiah: Studies in the Relationship between Judaism and Christianity. By LEV Gillet. (Lutterworth Press, London. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

The author of this book is an Orthodox Russian Christian who was formerly on the staff of the Russian Theological Seminary in Paris. He has a profound interest in the Jews, much knowledge about their literature, history and thought, and a deep desire to see Judaism and Christianity brought closer together. At the same time he disapproves of Christian Missions to Jews, of the ordinary kind.

In modern times there has grown up an attitude of understanding in some circles between Jews and Christians, and various symposia to which Jews and Christians have contributed, have been published. This is, of course, not without parallel elsewhere, where the sharpness of religious barriers has been softened, and sympathy has replaced prejudice as the spirit of approach. Father Gillet would differentiate the case of Judaism and Christianity from any other, and there are obvious reasons for this. Christianity was born out of the womb of Judaism, and the Old Testament belongs to the Bible of both Christian and Jew. But Father Gillet does not ignore, as so many Christians do, all the centuries of Judaism that lie between New Testament days and our own. He rightly holds that no one can hope to approach the Jew fruitfully without a sound understanding of those centuries.

What he desires, however, is something much more far-reaching than understanding and co-operation. He believes that the Christian Church has a mission not alone to individual Jews, but to Judaism as such, that at the same time Judaism has a mission to the Church, and that neither Christianity nor Judaism can be perfected without the other. He emphasizes elements in Jewish tradition which have fallen into the background, and especially certain aspects of the Messianic hope, and he would have them brought afresh into the focus of interest. He would also see the hope of the Second Coming of Christ, which has been largely transformed or relegated to the background in many Christian circles, revived and placed in the forefront of interest and preaching. He believes that here lies the link which can bring Church and Synagogue closer together.

What he has in mind is a re-created Jewish Christianity, whose members would not cease to be Jews because they were Christians, and who would continue to observe the Jewish laws and customs and at the same time be full members of the Synagogue and of a Christian community. This community should either be an independent one, or a branch of one of the main bodies of Christians. He cites instances of individual Jews who have professed Christianity while refraining from baptism, and continuing in full fellowship with the Synagogue. This attitude is not confined to Jews. There are members of other faiths who have been able to say as Lichtenstein said of his study of the Gospel: "I looked for thorns and gathered roses," and who have revered Christ while not breaking with their own faith. The creation of a fully recognized Christian community within the framework of the Jewish community is, however, a very different and a much more difficult proposition.

Probably few readers of THE ARYAN

PATH will be interested in this programme, and the reviewer has little confidence that it holds any high promise either for Judaism or for Christianity. The real importance of the book lies less in this programme, however, than in the spirit of rich understanding and sympathy for the religion not professed by the author which breathes through its pages. Few non-Jews can have written of Judaism with more large-hearted and sympathetic penetration, and whoever would understand the religion of the people which has become so largely the symbol of the world's divisions and the world's agonies in our day, can find no better guide. The book is erudite to a degree, yet eminently readable, and it presents a great deal of factual information which is not readily accessible elsewhere. For its stores of knowledge and the fine charity of its spirit it has a high value quite independent of the programme it advocates.

H. H. ROWLEY

The Complaint and the Answer: Being Allama SIR MUHAMMAD IQBAL'S *Shikwah & Jawab-i-Shikwah* Done into English Verse. By ALTAF HUSAIN. (Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, Kashmiri Bazaar, Lahore. Rs. 2/-)

It would be gratuitous to define great poetry or to attempt an enumeration of its characteristics. But one thing is certain. It always transcends the particular. Thus these poems, though specifically preoccupied with the degradation of those who profess the Islamic faith, have an appeal even for those outside that fold. The complaint against God, which forms the first part of the poem, is that He has ceased bestowing Grace upon those who have all along been striving to keep the torch of Islam burning. The second part, which forms the answer to the complaint, refutes the allegation. The accuser himself is accused of want of faith, selfishness, sectarianism, unthinking luxury and disregard of human brotherhood, which older teachers and practitioners of the holy teachings finely exemplified. It is a common human tendency to rationalise misfortune and to shift the responsibility for ills to an arbitrary Destiny. The Answer rightly fixes the responsibility on man himself.

A generation which prides itself on its scepticism and its rationalistic approach feels frustrated when life deals out unpalatable doses. This accumulated sense of frustration of a whole age left dry and stranded on the shores of civilisation finds symbolical expression in the complaint and renders necessary the counter-indictment by way of answer. It records the spiritual bankruptcy of the age, and the hollowness which it tries to screen by complacence and self-deceptive fatalism.

The translation into English verse is superbly done and those who cannot read the original may well congratulate the translator on his masterly handling of a great poem of a great poet.

V. M. INAMDAR

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"_____ *ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers."
HUDIBRAS

Russia has been holding Germany in check. The U. S. A. and British politicians have been exulting over victories in North Africa, while Japan, listening to the talk of the second front against Germany in Europe, seems to be taking good advantage by completing its preparations to meet its enemy in Asia. But important as these may seem, other events have precipitated and these cannot but be regarded as more significant for the future peace of the international world.

China fights on still unaided by her allies. Labour strikes in the U.S.A. have enabled vested interests to weaken the Presidential throne in the White House; and the Negro riots are the first visible eruption of the underground rumblings heard now for a long period. In South Africa the Government of Field-Marshal Smuts has carried the unchivalrous war against Indians one long step further, giving the whole world a tangible proof that Smuts and his friends do not love Justice and therefore are incapable of sharing in the ushering in of a lasting peace. His bad example is copied by the two French Generals, supported by the U.S.A. and Britain, who decide the fate of coloured subjects of the old French Empire. Here India, on the verge of starvation, wears a sullen countenance and is heavily veiled in silent resentment, with what result who can tell? As Lin Yutang well points out in his article reprinted by *The Bombay Chronicle* from the New York *Nation*, it is all a matter of Karma and even Winston Churchill is no exception to the operations of the ever-present Law which ever moves to righteousness....

Lin Yutang's article strikes a note of warning but the ears of the arrogant are most often closed to the words of philosophers and true friends. But where even philosophers fail Karma succeeds. Our readers' attention may be drawn to our editorial for February on "The Karma of Nations."

H. G. Wells has castigated Smuts for his folly which perpetrates the sin of colour bar. Writing in the *Evening Standard* (16th March) he says to the Field Marshal:—

> The blacks are wilfully degraded, but they increase and multiply. The breath of freedom is blowing round the world, and it will blow into your Dominion as elsewhere. What sort of black man do you want to have to face when the inevitable adjustment comes?

But it seems curious to us that so experienced a publicist as H. G. Wells still believes in the verbal assurances of "our governors":—

> Yet so far as our governors have given us any intimations of our war aims, it is against that all-devouring State of Hobbes and Smuts, and for the individual freedom of mankind, white, yellow, brown or black, that we fight.

Mr. Wells must posit the same question to Mr. Churchill which he puts to Field-Marshal Smuts:—

I ask you, when all the rest of the world is made equal and free, how can the petty white tyranny of your system escape a convulsion ?

The Browns of India settled in Africa and the Negroes who love their Native land, both of whom Smuts treats in the manner of Hitler his Jews, will one day inevitably join hands and riot against the Whites, as Negroes did in Detroit. Machine-guns can put this down but—!

John Brown's body lies a-mouldering in the grave
But his soul is marching on.

Surely the undeniable fact that it poisons human relationships can legitmately be included in the charge-sheet against imperialism. One reason Miss Margaret Pope gives for supporting Indian independence is "what imperialism does to the relationship between the 'white man' and the 'native' in India."

I should say that the roots of imperialism in India today lie even deeper than economics : they lie in the festering bed of a colossal lack of understanding from which the present generation of English in India have neither the mental energy nor the ideological stimulus to extricate themselves.

She despairs of the possibility of their conversion to the Indian point of view. "They do not possess an international outlook; they possess an imperialistic one; they cannot change so long as they occupy their present position in India." Truly, as Miss Pope declares, "India reveals the inconsistency of democracy with empire—the impossibility of maintaining democratic institutions intact and supporting a system of colonial exploitation at the same time." Hard as imperialism bears upon its victims, "the failure of a free people to see the freedom of other peoples in perspective" must react detrimentally on the imperialists themselves. Already, Miss Pope declares, they are outstripped in international thinking by Indians and Chinese.

Imperialism as manifested in the Arab countries and India is a reflection of that weakness which, as yet, all the progressive forces and ideologies working in England and on England from outside have not been able to counteract....The question for the British today is: Can they make good their deficiencies of ideology and experience in time to prevent collapse? It means, in fact, can they liquidate their imperialism in time to escape the logical consequences of that imperialism working inevitably against them ?

And about ideologies Dr. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy has some true ideas in his article "Am I My Brother's Keeper ?" in the March *Asia and the Americas* :—

The bases of modern civilization are to such a degree rotten to the core that it has been forgotten even by the learned that man ever attempted to live otherwise than by bread alone.

Behind all this there is a fanaticism that cannot away with any sort of wisdom that is not of its own date and kind and the product of its own pragmatic calculations; "there is a rancour," as Hermes Trismegistus said, "that is contemptuous of immortality, and will not let us recognize what is divine in us."

If reading and writing are to enable the Indian and Chinese masses to read what the western proletariat reads, they will remain better off, from any cultural point of view, with their own more classical literature of which all have oral knowledge.

Ralph Tyler Flewelling's editorial in the Winter 1943 issue of *The Personalist* on "The Place of Imponderables in a Democracy" puts the outcome of the present conflict on the shoulders of Everyman. Against the totalitarians' complete trust in physical power,

democracy sets belief in the strength of the righteous individual. And since democracy's success depends upon the common man, the elements which will strengthen his character are vitally important—" a faith in the power of the spirit, a new appreciation of the unconquerable strength of righteousness." Morale is weak because morals are confused. The real "fifth columnists," he sees as those who imperil democracy's future by mental dishonesty. The student who cheats and the politician who buys votes disintegrate

> the person himself, on whom the social order depends for integrity, honesty, sense of fair play, self-restraint and downright righteousness without which any civilization will perish....Until the forces of righteousness in the persons of honest men arise in the totalitarian and other states there can be no peace.

Mr. Flewelling observes that nature might have taught us much "had we gone to the forests, the winds, and the tides for wisdom instead of gazing with such rapt admiration on the work of our hands." In nature, the life-force in the acorn in its crevice can split a mighty rock. So, he points out, we may find that in politics and society "the mightiest powers are not the most obvious, nor the most clamorous."

> The captains and the kings will eventually depart, in spite of their boasts, having cancelled each other out. When the tumult and shouting of war have ceased the silent forces of human good-will, which now seem so weak, will arise in the social order as conquering forces with the same assurance that the rising sap of the oak will push off the dead leaves of yesteryear. We can neither fight the war that is now upon us nor achieve the peace for which we pray without digging down for ultimate support to the deep and silent moral and spiritual principles which alone can justify the existence of political institutions and can make human life worth living....No house of lies has ever yet been built strong enough to withstand the impact of the winds of truth, and eventually the just spirit of man is the most persistent and the most triumphant thing in the earth.

In the *Northern India Observer* for June the Hon. Sir Douglas Young, Chief Justice of the Lahore High Court, proposes an All-India Youth Movement "designed to bind the youth of India together in an unselfish comradeship, directed to the furtherance of their country's good." The movement he envisages would use scouting as one of its educational methods but would not form part of scouting.

> The movement must be entirely Indian, and it should be based on the ideal of the independence of India as a free nation.

We would not concede either India's present utter uselessness nor her claim to priority among the nations for absence of "early education in discipline, self-control and character training." A tree must be judged by its fruits. Many an unprivileged Indian villager will not come off second-best in an ethical comparison with the sophisticated product of Western education, indoctrinated from childhood with the spirit of selfishness and competition. Personal selfishness is not encouraged to grow so rampant in the East, where the consciousness is normally strong of belonging to a group and of having obligations to it. For the millions of poor Hindus Karma and Reincarnation are realities, unquestioningly accepted, and there is no spur to moral living like the conviction that a man must reap exactly what he sows.

But these points of disagreement aside, Sir Douglas's proposal merits careful consideration. We heartily agree with him that

if India is ever to attain her rightful position in the world her young people at least must have unity, however foolish the older people may be.

A boys' club for every village is a laudable aim. Physical education, sports and games in common no doubt will help to break down communal barriers—but something more is needed. The ease with which the Youth Movement in Germany was perverted into a most effective party tool dictates caution. If the movement is not to turn out intellectual robots, *free* young men and women must be the dominating aim—free intellectually, free morally, unprejudiced and unselfish. The building up of the physique of the nation is very important, but it is secondary to the strengthening of moral sensitiveness, of intellectual integrity and of the sense of national unity. The quality of the tool is important but more important that of the user of the tool.

Several months ago, in the Navroz Number of *Rast-Rahbar* was urged a national cultural organisation of Indian youth, a national institution where love of India, self-respect and gracious tolerance would destroy narrow creedalism and illiberal communalism. Such an organisation, it was suggested, could promote the joint celebration of communal festivals, giving them a national instead of a creedal colouring. It could encourage the study of others' scriptures as literature and further the spread of the great writings in the various Indian Languages. Such an organisation is greatly needed—at least for the educated youth who will be the natural leaders of the movement Sir Douglas proposes. Rightly conceived and conducted, it would be t latter's complement and missing soul

---

Mr. G. D. H. Cole has ably summ rised the aims and history of the organisation in *The Fabian Society Past and Present.* The Fabian Socie seeks, "by the methods of politic democracy,"

the establishment of a society in whi equality of opportunity will be assured a the economic power and privileges of indivi uals and classes abolished through t collective ownership and democratic cont of the economic resources of the communit

This account by Mr. Cole is No. 2 in the Society's Tract Series. Research Series deals with particula problems from the Socialist angle, an there is a more popular propagand series. Within the broad frame Socialism and Democracy the Societ recognises no rigid orthodoxy. It b lieves in free and frank inquiry an publishes the results whether it agree with them or not. It attempts to forc conclusions upon nobody. It abjur emotional appeal and holds "muddle good-will" in very slight esteem.

An Indian branch of the Fabia Society with its broad toleranc humanitarian ideals and openness t facts could do most valuable work One was formed in Madras nearly quarter of a century ago but unfortu nately fell into desuetude.

We regret to chronicle the death o our esteemed friend Rajakaryapravin N. S. Subba Rao who was a regula contributor to our pages. His work i our review pages drew appreciatio and he did it all as a labour of love.